DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 429 380 EC 307 114

TITLE	Reauthorization of the Education of the Deaf Act. Hearing of the Committee on Labor and Human Resources on Examining Proposed Legislation Authorizing Funds for Gallaudet University and the National Technical Institute for Deaf as Contained in the Education of the Deaf Act. United States Senate, One Hundred Fifth Congress, Second Session.
INSTITUTION	Congress of the U.S., Washington, DC. Senate Committee on Labor and Human Resources.
REPORT NO	Senate-Hrg-105-414
ISBN	ISBN-0-16-056365-8
PUB DATE	1998-02-12
NOTE	61p.
AVAILABLE FROM	U.S. Government Printing Office, Superintendent of Documents, Congressional Sales Office, Washington, DC 20402.
PUB TYPE	Legal/Legislative/Regulatory Materials (090)
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC03 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	*Deafness; *Educational Legislation; Elementary Secondary Education; Federal Aid; *Federal Legislation; Hearings; *Special Education
IDENTIFIERS	Congress 105th; *Education of the Deaf Act 1986; Reauthorization Legislation

ABSTRACT

This transcript reports on a Senate hearing concerning the reauthorization of the Education of the Deaf Act. As well as statements by committee members, the transcript presents statements by and answers to questions of the following: students at Gallaudet University (Washington, DC), students at the National Technical Institute for the Deaf (New York), Jordan I. King, president of Gallaudet University; Robert R. DaVila, vice president of National Technical Institute for the Deaf; Judith Heumann, Assistant Secretary for Special Education and Rehabilitative Services, Department of Education; Carol Cichowski, Director, Special Education, Rehabilitation and Research Analysis Division, Department of Education; Ramone Rodriguez, Liaison Office for Special Institutions, Department of Education; Sarah E. Snyder, Alexander Graham Bell Association for the Deaf; and Nancy J. Bloch, President, National Association for the Deaf. Additional material includes a chart showing placements of Gallaudet graduates and responses to questions asked by Senators James Jeffords and Tom Harkin. (DB)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

EC

S. HRG. 105-414

REAUTHORIZATION OF THE EDUCATION OF THE DEAF ACT

ED 429 380

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

HEARING

OF THE

COMMITTEE ON LABOR AND HUMAN RESOURCES UNITED STATES SENATE

ONE HUNDRED FIFTH CONGRESS

SECOND SESSION

ON

EXAMINING PROPOSED LEGISLATION AUTHORIZING FUNDS FOR GALLAUDET UNIVERSITY AND THE NATIONAL TECHNICAL INSTITUTE FOR THE DEAF AS CONTAINED IN THE EDUCATION OF THE DEAF ACT

FEBRUARY 12, 1998

Printed for the use of the Committee on Labor and Human Resources

U.S. GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE
46-678 CC WASHINGTON : 1998

For sale by the U.S. Government Printing Office
Superintendent of Documents, Congressional Sales Office, Washington, DC 20402
ISBN 0-16-056365-8

EC 307114

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

COMMITTEE ON LABOR AND HUMAN RESOURCES

JAMES M. JEFFORDS, Vermont, *Chairman*

DAN COATS, Indiana
JUDD GREGG, New Hampshire
BILL FRIST, Tennessee
MIKE DeWINE, Ohio
MICHAEL B. ENZI, Wyoming
TIM HUTCHINSON, Arkansas
SUSAN M. COLLINS, Maine
JOHN W. WARNER, Virginia
MITCH McCONNELL, Kentucky

EDWARD M. KENNEDY, Massachusetts
CHRISTOPHER J. DODD, Connecticut
TOM HARKIN, Iowa
BARBARA A. MIKULSKI, Maryland
JEFF BINGAMAN, New Mexico
PAUL D. WELLSTONE, Minnesota
PATTY MURRAY, Washington
JACK REED, Rhode Island

MARK E. POWDEN, *Staff Director*
SUSAN K. HATTAN, *Deputy Staff Director*
WILLIAM G. DAUSTER, *Minority Chief of Staff and Chief Counsel*

CONTENTS

STATEMENTS

THURSDAY, FEBRUARY 12, 1998

	Page
Jeffords, Hon. James M., opening statement	1
Clancy, Megan, MA, accompanied by Mollie Easter, Algona, IA, and Rebecca Ellis, Putney, VT, students at Gallaudet University, Washington, DC; and Meghan Rainone, Marlton, NJ, accompanied by Matthew Hamill, Loveland, OH, and Kathryn Hoheusle, Bethel, NY, students at National Technical Institute For the Deaf, Rochester Institute of Technology, Rochester, NY	2
Prepared statement	4
Harkin, Hon. Tom, a U.S. Senator from the State of Iowa, opening statement	9
Jordan, I. King, president, Gallaudet University, Washington, DC; and Robert R. DaVila, vice president, National Technical Institute For the Deaf, Rochester Institute of Technology, Rochester, NY	15
Prepared statements of:	
Mr. Jordan	17
Mr. DaVila	23
Heumann, Judith, Assistant Secretary for Special Education and Rehabilitative Services, U.S. Department of Education, Washington, DC, accompanied by Carol Cichowski, Director, Special Education, Rehabilitation and Research Analysis Division, and Ramone Rodriguez, Liaison Officer for Special Institutions	35
Prepared statement	38
Snyder, Sarah E., Department of Professional Programs and Services, Alexander Graham Bell Association for the Deaf; and Nancy J. Bloch, president, National Association for the Deaf, Silver Spring, MD	41
Prepared statements of:	
Ms. Snyder	44
M. Bloch	51

ADDITIONAL MATERIAL

Articles, publications, letters, etc.:	
Placement of Gallaudet Bachelor's Degree Recipients	28
Responses of Mr. DaVila to questions asked by Senator Jeffords	31
Response of Mr. Jordan to a question asked by Senator Harkin	35

REAUTHORIZATION OF THE EDUCATION OF THE DEAF ACT

THURSDAY, FEBRUARY 12, 1998

U.S. SENATE,
COMMITTEE ON LABOR AND HUMAN RESOURCES,
Washington, DC.

The committee met, pursuant to notice, at 10:02 a.m., in room SD–430, Dirksen Senate Office Building, Senator Jeffords (chairman of the committee) presiding.

Present: Senators Jeffords and Harkin.

OPENING STATEMENT OF SENATOR JEFFORDS

The CHAIRMAN. The Committee on Labor and Human Resources will come to order.

We are pleased today to be holding a hearing on the Education of the Deaf Act. I am pleased to see everyone here.

Gallaudet University and the National Technical Institute for the Deaf at the Rochester Institute of Technology play a central and necessary role for students who are deaf and hard of hearing seeking postsecondary educational opportunities. Through their unique and complementary programs, these two institutions have contributed significantly to the postsecondary education and successful employment of individuals who are deaf, here and in many foreign countries, through the improvement in the quality of education that deaf students receive, the quality and quantity of interpreter services available throughout the country, and the public's greater willingness to address the communication-related needs of individuals with hearing impairments in diverse settings.

This committee last authorized the Education of the Deaf Act in 1992. The Act's purpose is to authorize Federal funding for Gallaudet and NTID. We made substantial improvements in the law in 1992 and, by most accounts, the law is working well today. We need to preserve and build on the 1992 Amendments. We seek information in that context. We also welcome information about the barriers that individuals face in educational settings and how assistive technology should or could reduce these barriers. This latter information will help us later this year when we begin the reauthorization of the Tech Act.

I am looking forward to the testimony from our witnesses, especially our first panel, which includes three students from Gallaudet University and three students from the National Technical Institute for the Deaf. One witness, Rebecca Ellis, from Putney, VT, is my constituent.

The young people of America are an essential part of our society, and we want to do everything we can to help all elements of our society in that respect.

The CHAIRMAN. I would now like to introduce the first panel. We are very pleased to have with us today six students who are impressive in what they have achieved, both academically and personally.

First, we will hear from Megan Clancy, a senior at Gallaudet University who will receive her B.A. in biology this spring.

Next, Meghan Rainone, a student from the National Technical Institute for the Deaf, will testify. Ms. Rainone has the distinction of being Miss Deaf America and has the opportunity to visit many other hardworking deaf and hearing students.

Also with us from Gallaudet University are Rebecca Ellis, a constituent of mine from Putney, VT and Mollie Easter, a freshman from Algona, IA, who plans to pursue studies in physical education.

Also from NTID are Kathryn Hoheusle, an imaging science major from Bethel, NY, and Matthew Hamill, a champion wrestler from Loveland, OH.

We are pleased to have all of you with us, and now, we would like to hear from you. Ms. Clancy and Ms. Rainone will both be offering testimony; however, all of the panelists will be able to tell us about their experiences on their campuses and how they value attending schools which are dedicated to educating deaf students.

Megan, would you please proceed?

STATEMENTS OF MEGAN CLANCY, BOSTON, MA, ACCOMPANIED BY MOLLIE EASTER, ALGONA, IA, AND REBECCA ELLIS, PUTNEY, VT, STUDENTS AT GALLAUDET UNIVERSITY, WASHINGTON, DC; AND MEGHAN RAINONE, MARLTON, NJ, ACCOMPANIED BY MATTHEW HAMILL, LOVELAND, OH, AND KATHRYN HOHEUSLE, BETHEL, NY, STUDENTS AT NATIONAL TECHNICAL INSTITUTE FOR THE DEAF, ROCHESTER INSTITUTE OF TECHNOLOGY, ROCHESTER, NY

Ms. Clancy [Through Sign Interpreter.] Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, I am Megan Clancy, and I am a senior at Gallaudet University from South Boston, MA. At the table with me today are Rebecca Ellis and Mollie Easter. Rebecca is a freshman from Putney, VT, and Mollie Easter is from Algona, IA.

I am extremely pleased to have this opportunity to be here with you today to testify in support of the reauthorization of Gallaudet University. My experience had been primarily to only be around students who were nondeaf, and up through my junior high school years, I had no idea of who I was as a deaf person until I had the opportunity to go to Gallaudet University, which meant a great deal to me because then I came in touch with who I am as a deaf woman.

There are enormous advantages for me being at Gallaudet University, among which has been to be in touch with esteemed researchers who were able to assist me as a student in figuring out what I wanted to do with my life, and many professors and advisers who had an important role as well. It was important for me in coming to Gallaudet University to have these role models who are deaf.

Very soon, as has been mentioned, I will be graduating from Gallaudet in May with a B.A.

One of the advantages has also been the opportunity to have contact with professional deaf scientists. I have had the opportunity to work with an esteemed and distinguished scientist at Stanford University who has been looking at research into cures for rare childhood diseases and also looks at human genetics. This person had an instrumental role in assisting me in figuring out what my life was going to be like once I graduated from Gallaudet.

Had it not been for Gallaudet University, and had it not been for my contact with deaf individuals who could put me in contact with these other persons, I do not know that I would be where I am today. I am not sure that, had I gone to any other university that serves primarily nondeaf students, I could have been able to do what I have done at Gallaudet.

For these reasons which I have listed for you, Gallaudet holds for me an irreplaceable place in my heart.

I also have the distinction of having been selected to be in the honors programs at Gallaudet University and have completed my thesis in human genetics. As I said, I worked with a scientist at Stanford University, and my thesis, if it is of any interest to you—it is a bit technical—is entitled, "Ataxia Telangiectasia: Unraveling the Mystery."

I have completed this paper, and as a result of having studied this subject, I have decided to go on to graduate school to further my studies in human genetics, perhaps looking specifically at what opportunities there are out there to study disease among children.

Another advantage of attending Gallaudet has been the opportunity to be in consortia. I have been able to take some advanced biochemistry classes at George Washington University in order to further my studies. I would never have been able to do that had I not been as well-prepared as I was by Gallaudet University in the core chemistry and biology courses that I needed to have, because the information is so technical and certainly could have been incredibly overwhelming had I not been able to keep up. I believe that I was able to successfully keep up with those classes simply because Gallaudet had done such a good job of preparing me to be in those courses.

The professors whom I have had who are deaf have had exactly the same expectations from me as I am sure professors at any university serving nondeaf people would have had. I never felt that I was expected to do less than anyone else.

So it is without any reserve whatsoever that I would be more than happy to encourage any student I meet who is deaf to go to Gallaudet University, to get that experience, as well as the opportunity to experience diversity among a student population.

It is indeed true that Gallaudet University is a very diverse place, not only diversity from within the country but also from without. And it is through these interactions with students from other countries and with our own people here that we have gained a way to respect other people's norms, other people's religions, other people's ways of life, and all of that has been so important through those interactions that have been afforded to me as a student at Gallaudet University.

So I am hoping that there will remain this opportunity for international students to be able to come to Gallaudet, because they contribute so much to our own educational horizons.

In closing, I would like to thank you all so much for taking the time to let me come here and speak with you, and I am hoping that in some way, something I have said perhaps will make a difference.

Thank you again.

[The prepared statement of Ms. Clancy follows:]

PREPARED STATEMENT OF MEGAN CLANCY

Mr. Chairman and members of the committee: My name is Megan Clancy. I am a senior at Gallaudet University from South Boston, MA. At the table with me today are Rebecca Ellis, a freshman from Putney, VT; and Mollie Easter, a freshman from Algona, IA.

I am pleased to appear before you today to testify in support of the reauthorization of Gallaudet University. Since I grew up in mainstream schools and interacted mostly with hearing peers after school and at summer camps, I had never discovered my deaf identity until I arrived at Gallaudet in the fall of 1993.

After attending the summer programs for deaf youths offered at Gallaudet in the summers of 1992 and 1993, I applied to Gallaudet because I wanted to have adult deaf role models to look up to and to help guide me in my career path. As a direct result of the dedication and commitment of my Gallaudet professors and advisers, I will graduate in May with a BA in Biology.

Gallaudet offered me a very good network with deaf scientists whom I could follow as I pursued my degree. For instance, through Gallaudet I met Dr. Leon Kapp, a scientist at Stanford University who does research to find a cure for rare childhood diseases, and I continue to remain in contact with him as he advises me on future educational goals. I am in the Honors Program at Gallaudet and recently completed my Senior Honors Thesis entitled "Ataxia Telangiectasia: Unraveling the Mystery." In order to pursue my interest in genetics, I am currently applying to several graduate schools which have programs leading to a Ph.D. in Human Genetics.

1 have attended a class in Cell Biology through the Washington Consortium at George Washington University which holds the reputation of having a highly rigorous curriculum, and I felt that the prerequisite courses in Biology and Microbiology I took at Gallaudet prepared me very well to handle such a difficult technical class.

My Gallaudet professors—especially my deaf professors—have always had high expectations of me, as high as at a hearing institution I am sure.

While I chose Gallaudet because of the "level playing field" it affords deaf students, I have cherished the deaf culture that comes with the "Gallaudet experience." I very much enjoyed learning from deaf professors and would recommend Gallaudet to any young deaf person who is making the critical decision about where to attend college. I am glad that I chose Gallaudet as the home of my undergraduate experience.

The Gallaudet student community is wonderfully diverse and it allows all of us to respect other cultures in terms of religion, behavior and customs: This is why it is so important that Gallaudet continues to enroll students from around the world. It enriches each of us individually and the University as a whole and will serve us well as we go out into the world of work.

Thank you for giving me the opportunity to testify before you today. Rebecca, Mollie, and I will be happy to answer any questions you may have.

The CHAIRMAN. Thank you for excellent testimony, and I I will look forward to watching your career, and I am sure you will be successful and will hopefully help us with some of the problems we face, especially in genetics.

Meghan.

Ms. RAINONE [Through Sign Interpreter]. Good morning. I am very honored to be here this morning to represent NTID, the National Technical Institute for the Deaf.

Before I go on and introduce myself, I would like to introduce my co-panelists.

Mr. HAMILL [Through Sign Interpreter]. Good morning. My name is Matt Hamill, and I am from Loveland, OH. I transferred from

Purdue, where I had a full scholarship in wrestling, to NTID. At Purdue, I was not really able to have a full social life.

Now, I am taking electrical engineering at NTID. I wanted to have a good foundation, and I wanted to be able to be with other deaf people, and that is the best reason why I wanted to go transfer from Purdue to NTID. I wanted to learn more about the deaf community.

Also, I was the national champion in wrestling when I was at NTID, and I had the opportunity to do that there. At Purdue, that was not the case for me. Now, understand, the most important thing for me was to get a good foundation in education. I am looking forward to attending the Deaf Olympics in the year 2000, and I am hoping to be able to represent NTID there.

Thank you.

Ms. HOHEUSLE [Through Sign Interpreter]. Good morning. My name is Kathryn Hoheusle, and my major at RIT is imaging sciences; I am in my third year. I was a physics major, and I transferred into imaging sciences.

I am very involved in the NTID community with the College Bowl, and I am on the team from NTID. In 1996, at the NAD Conference, we won the College Bowl Championship.

I was accepted at eight different East Coast colleges. One was Dartmouth. But I felt that NTID had good support services for me that I would need as a deaf person, and I wanted to be able to socialize with deaf people and have an identity as a deaf individual. And I have been able to feel a part of the deaf community because of my involvement at NTID.

Thank you.

Ms. RAINONE. Thank you.

Let me introduce myself. I am Meghan Rainone, and I am from Marlton, NJ, and I will be graduating this May. I am studying criminal justice, and I am hoping to go to law school to pursue my legal training and my career.

When I applied to RIT, it was the only school that I chose. It was a risk, but I chose that school for two reasons. First, let me explain that I have an older sister, Rebecca, who is 5 years older than I, and she had gone to RIT first. I had the opportunity as her younger sister to visit her and see NTID, and I was amazed at the community; I was very impressed with the community itself and the support services that were offered by the school. I knew that that was where I needed to go and earn my degree. So I applied, and I got into RIT.

When I look back at NTID and what I have learned—they provide interpreting services, notetakers, everything I could have asked for—I cannot imagine anything else that they could have offered me to give me a better education.

When you look at the work world, technology is everywhere, and RIT prepares me well to learn about the new innovations in technology, and at the same time, they lower the barriers to communication and allow me to work with my hearing peers so that I will be more prepared to enter the world of work. I thank RIT for this opportunity. It has been wonderful to me—it has been wonderful as an education and as a cultural experience. I really had not had the opportunity to acquire an awareness of the culture of deafness

until I was able to attend NTID. They met my needs as a student and as a deaf woman. They helped me with my own self-identity. And if not because of my experiences there, I would never have become Miss Deaf America.

Now, I have been able to travel for a year and a half, and soon, I am going to have to give my crown to another girl, but as I look back at my experiences meeting people, I have been exposed to every aspect of the deaf community, and I realize that NTID was one of the strongest places serving the deaf community that I was able to see anywhere. I do not think I have ever seen a better example of the deaf community. I have met many different students, and I have seen the kind of support they are getting in their schools for the deaf and in their departments, and I am so grateful to be a student at NTID. I could not receive a better education anywhere for myself as an individual.

I am very proud to be here today to share with you this message, and I hope I can convince you that we really need your support to give us better opportunities, for students and for deaf individuals. We are only three of many students, and we have many, many dreams among us. We want to do many things, and you are the people who can make that happen.

Thank you.

The CHAIRMAN. Well, thank you very much. That is very compelling testimony, I must say.

Ms. Easter or Ms. Ellis, would you like to say anything?

Ms. ELLIS [Through Sign Interpreter]. Really, I think that Megan said everything that we wanted to say.

The CHAIRMAN. All right; it was done very well.

Let me ask you some questions, and please, anyone who wishes to respond, let us know, and we will listen to each and every one of you.

Some of you attended regular public schools, and some of you attended schools for the deaf. I would like to know why each of you chose to attend either Gallaudet or NTID.

Ms. ELLIS. I am one of the people who have been in schools for the deaf. I have always been in the deaf community, and my family has always been very supportive of my involvement with the deaf community. When I was looking around at different colleges, looking at what my options were, I really saw that Gallaudet would be the best for me.

I did not have an opportunity to go to California State University at Northridge. I did go to NTID and take a look around. But once I actually made the decision to attend Gallaudet and came onto the campus, I can honestly say that I have absolutely no regrets about the choice I made.

The CHAIRMAN. Yes, Ms. Rainone?

Ms. RAINONE. I have something to add. As a deaf child of hearing parents, I knew I wanted the best of both worlds—and I have been exposed to hearing society and deaf society—and I knew that RIT was going to help me meet both of those needs. It was a really good fit for my needs.

Now, I did take a look at Gallaudet and California State, and they are very good schools. It is really a matter of preference and where my personality fit, and I felt that the other schools were

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

wonderful, but I fit at RIT. And I am sure the Gallaudet students feel that they fit in the Gallaudet environment.

Option is really a wonderful thing for all of us. We do not want to be limited. We want to have choices for ourselves to see that we can choose a college where we want to go and have the support that we need.

The CHAIRMAN. Ms. Clancy?

Ms. CLANCY. If I could add, I have to really agree with Ms. Rainone. I think each person has a certain personality, and there is usually a place where it can fit best.

I also had an opportunity to attend two summer programs at Gallaudet in 1992 and 1993, and that is when I was really sold on Gallaudet. And I have had a great undergraduate experience as a result. It is the perfect place for someone to come in and see deaf culture from womb to tomb, in many ways. You can see it at the elementary level and see this whole deaf community grow, literally from infancy into adulthood. It was a wonderful opportunity for me, and I really cannot speak enough about how much I appreciate that.

Ms. HOHEUSLE. I was mainstreamed in my education, and I really had no exposure to the deaf community until I went to NTID. I was in a group called Explorers of the Future at NTID, which was a camp experience, and that is where I first met deaf people.

Also, my high school was a very strong supporter of science and science education, and RIT offered that to me. NTID was really a benefit to me and really helped me in my college experience.

So the technical advances and the education at RIT and NTID really convinced me to go there.

Mr. HAMILL. I agree. Remember, I mentioned that I had gone to Purdue and then transferred to NTID. That was really a good fit for me. Also, it was wonderful for me in my wrestling and my social life. At Purdue, they did not really have a good deaf program, and they would always say, "Well, we could do this, but...." And then, when I arrived at NTID, everybody could sign, and I learned to sign—I have to admit I did not sign very well when I got there, but the people were very wonderful and taught me how to sign and allowed me to have a better social experience at NTID.

Ms. EASTER. When I was growing up, I was the only deaf person in my high school, and I can remember when I got to Gallaudet, I cannot even begin to describe what a difference it was for me. I had almost gone to Iowa State University, but when I saw Gallaudet, I decided to come here, and it has been a great experience for me because I have been able to add this whole component, as Megan has said, of having the deaf experience. And I think that that has been very important for me because of the fact that I am a deaf person; I have had half of the experience of who I am as a person, and Gallaudet has provided me with the whole experience.

Ms. HOHEUSLE. I forgot to mention something. NTID has a wonderful support environment—the faculty, the staff, the administration, the students—they all support you no matter what you are doing. No one is against you, and it just feels like they are trying to help you in anything that you want to do. Again, that is another reason why I support NTID.

Mr. HAMILL. In my opinion, NTID is the best engineering school in the country. That is what I believe.

The CHAIRMAN. Well, thank you all very much. That is very helpful testimony for us.

Several of you have mentioned that you intend to go to graduate school after completion of your undergraduate degree. How do you feel your schools have prepared you for learning in graduate schools, which may not have the same kind and amount of excellent support services that you have had in college? Are you concerned about your ability to be successful in graduate school?

Ms. HOHEUSLE. As a deaf individual growing up in a hearing environment, I was sure I was going to have 4 or 5 years of college, and then I was going to go to a hearing graduate school. That was my plan, to go to a deaf college, and that was my plan all the way through my years. But now I am thinking that I want to go back to RIT for my graduate school, and that way, I will have the best of both worlds while I am getting my Ph.D.

Ms. RAINONE. As I have mentioned, I am planning to go to law school. I have a confession to make, though. When I entered RIT, life was so much easier for me. When I needed an interpreter, I would go to the office and fill out a form, and I would have an interpreter. Now I am going to go out into the real world, and I realize that I am going to have to fight for better services for myself.

At RIT, though, they taught me how to fight for my rights and for what I need, and now I know exactly what it is I need for myself, and I am ready to get on with it and face whatever challenges I meet this fall. So I think that is a very positive thing that came out of my experience at NTID.

Ms. CLANCY. What Ms. Rainone has just said is something that I can really relate to. I spoke earlier about having opportunities to work with other scientists, and in some of my summer internships, it was interesting even trying to get interpreters when you get into a workplace, or even at a university like Stanford, where I was—in some ways, people view it as almost a luxury and not as the need that it is—and trying to get that across, for purposes of communication, the need to have these interpreters available to me as I need them.

However, I think that often, people want to use an interpreter as a crutch and not have to deal directly with us for those people who are nondeaf, and there is a fear that is often generated when I attempt to speak to someone who is nondeaf, and they want to have an interpreter available. So I think that with the interpreting issue, there are probably pros and cons—yes, it does make information accessible, but when does it become a crutch, and when does that line get crossed.

What I have learned from Gallaudet, having had those various experiences, has been the importance of clear communication and for me to be able to advocate for those kinds of clear communications when necessary, especially as I prepare to go out into the work world.

Now, your question related to graduate school. I am getting ready to go probably to a graduate school at a nondeaf university, and as I go to these places and require interpreters, if I should encounter any obstacles, from what I have learned from conferences,

as well as at Gallaudet, I know about what my rights are and also what my role is and what the school's role is in regard to getting an appropriate education.

In the past, I think I would have been fairly passive about the whole thing and would probably not have allowed myself to get the kind of education that I have a right to have. But as a result of being at Gallaudet, I have gotten that experience, and now I have had experience to be able to go out and function as a productive member of society, and in order for me to move along the way that I need to move along as a human being in this world, I will know what to do.

I also now have a repository of knowledge that I can share with other people about how to resolve some of these issues. So in many ways, I have been taught things that I will now be able to teach to others, and that is important, because in many ways, I think that that has helped to develop me as a leader.

The CHAIRMAN. Thank you all.

I am going to turn to a friend of mine who came to Congress with me about a thousand years ago. I think we have each been involved every step of the way in every piece of legislation that has dealt with people with disabilities, and we have had some wonderful, rewarding times.

I am pleased to have you here, Senator Harkin, and please proceed. You may make an opening statement, too.

OPENING STATEMENT OF SENATOR HARKIN

Senator HARKIN. Thank you. I appreciate that.

I am sorry for being late this morning, because I did want to be here, but I think I got most of the testimony of the students who are here. Let me just make a few opening comments, and then I would like to just follow that up with a couple of questions.

As many of you know, issues concerning the deaf are very close to my heart. I grew up with a brother who is deaf, so this has been an intense interest of mine all of my life. My brother became deaf when he was about 8 years old because of an illness, meningitis, and he was then sent away to the Iowa School for the Deaf and Dumb. And, as he said, "I may be deaf, but I am not dumb." But that is what schools for the deaf were called in those days—schools for the deaf and dumb.

I really appreciated what Meghan Rainone said about options and choices. In the past, and as I grew up with my brother and became more aware of deaf culture and the deaf community, I saw how every deaf person was put in a box. Every person who was deaf was the same, which we know is ridiculous on the surface, but that is the way it was done.

When my brother was in school, he was told that he could be one of three things—he could be a shoe cobbler, a baker, or a printer's assistant. Well, my brother said he did not want to be any one of those, and they said, "Well, fine, then, you are going to be a baker." So the options were very limited. And the one thing that I feel very strongly about is that we do not put people in boxes simply because they have one disability or another and that individuals have as many choices as possible in pursuing their education, pursuing their dreams, and pursuing their careers. That is why I am so con-

cerned that we have a system that allows the widest possible choices for students who are deaf.

With the Education of the Deaf Act, we are again reaffirming our commitment, hopefully, to this ideal. There are many things that go along with it—the Americans with Disabilities Act, the Technology for Individuals with Disabilities Act, IDEA, and a whole host of other things that have gone together to hopefully produce a seamless approach for fully integrating people with disabilities into all aspects of our life—not just work or education, but social activities, transportation, and everything else.

We have always, as my chairman has pointed out, had a bipartisan approach to this, and we have got to continue to have that. I hope that this year, we can reaffirm our commitment to the reauthorization of this Act to reaffirm the special role of Gallaudet University and NTID, both of which I have visited and have a good relationship with. The strides which Gallaudet and NTID have taken in recent years to cut costs and to prove themselves good stewards of taxpayers' dollars warrant this reauthorization and further support.

So I look forward to working with my colleagues on a bipartisan bill. I notice that next month marks the 10th anniversary of the Deaf President Now movement; I remember it well, and I share with people who are deaf all over this country a sense of pride in what those students did at Gallaudet. It resulted in the selection of the world's first university president who is deaf, Dr. I. King Jordan, who will be on our next panel. The Deaf President Now movement proved to the world that individuals who are deaf can, in the words of Dr. Jordan, "do everything hearing people do except hear." That is really the essence of the Education of the Deaf Act, and I look forward to its swift reauthorization.

Now, having said that, Ms. Rainone, you mentioned that you were going to law school. Have you looked at the Education of the Deaf Act—have any of you looked at it—and examined it? And do not feel embarrassed if you have not; a lot of people have not. But I just wonder if you have any thoughts for any changes in the Act from your own perspective.

Ms. RAINONE. Unfortunately, I have not had the opportunity to review that law. But in general, all I can say is that in general terms, I hope for more options, more opportunities. Really, I do not know if I can add any more to that.

Senator HARKIN. Well, that is how I feel. Can I assume all of you feel that way about options and opportunities?

Ms. HOHEUSLE. Yes.

Ms. EASTER. Yes, absolutely.

Senator HARKIN. Well, then, let me ask you this question. How do you feel that your college education has prepared you to work, earn a living or pursue your dreams in a hearing world? Has it really prepared you?

Ms. HOHEUSLE. I definitely can speak to that. I have learned how to get the services I need—for example, interpreting services—when needed. Sometimes, people also do not understand the role of interpreters, and I have had the confidence to be able to explain that role and explain to people how to work with an interpreter in an appropriate way and also have taken the initiative to under-

stand interpreters' codes of ethics and so on. I think that that is important, because I can take a lead in how interaction happens in the workplace.

Ms. RAINONE. I think that with the opportunity to have this mainstreaming occur at RIT, I had a lot of interaction with my hearing peers, and when I was required to work in a group, sometimes there would be communication barriers, but we would overcome them, and we would be able to figure out how to do that. A lot of times, we had to instruct people about looking at me and not at the interpreter—those basic kinds of things. But that interaction really taught me a lot about myself, because I was really able to see what it was that I in fact did need. Sometimes, I needed that background so I would know what problems were going to come up and provide me with the opportunity to start problem-solving.

I think that RIT and NTID have really prepared me well for the workplace. Currently, I am in an internship at the Public Interest Office in Rochester, NY, and I must admit that as a result of my experience there—which was only 10 weeks, and I recognize that is fairly short, and I am not sure that that is enough to make a solid decision—but there was a lot that I had to encounter—people talking around me, not having direct access to interpreters—learning how to work around that, how to make communication happen. That takes time, and I understand better now what kinds of things I am going to be facing, and from now on, I know that I will be able to make efforts to enhance my skills in interacting with people—-because that is the reality—I am going to be working with people who are not deaf.

But being a deaf woman will always be a part of me, a part of who I am, part of my personality, and nothing can change that, but I can certainly work with people around that.

Ms. ELLIS. Since arriving as a freshman at Gallaudet, they have already given me so many opportunities in such a short amount of time to really start realizing my own dreams. I have been thinking about different things I would like to do, photography being one of them, and they are already giving me whole ideas and experiences, even at this early stage, to be able to make decisions about what I want to do with my future.

It is also neat because I grew up in a very small town, Algona, IA, and coming here to Washington, DC has literally opened up the world. It has really been wonderful, and I think that having all of this experience on a much more global level will definitely prepare me, and I see that even now.

Ms. CLANCY. I was in an English literature class a couple of years ago with a deaf teacher, and he said that in some ways, being around deaf people in a deaf environment all the time is something of a fantasy, and there is really a reality to encounter. And I guess I had not really thought about that.

I think that if you are in an all-deaf environment all the time, sometimes you do not recognize what the barriers are going to be and what the struggles are going to be. I think that having those struggles has actually been important to me, because what it did was create a situation in which those struggles were the catalyst for me finding out who I was as a deaf woman.

Now, having had that opportunity, as I said, in high school, Gallaudet became a real option for me. And as I said, not only being at Gallaudet, but also having opportunities to be at other universities with nondeaf people has been a real advantage in some respects in creating, as I said, this kind of backdrop in which I could find myself as a deaf person.

I have been able to see that there are two parts of myself—part of me which understands what it is to be hearing, part of me which understands what it is to be deaf. And I have learned a lot through these internships which have taken me out, to help me in terms of coming to grips with that.

I would say that in general, I do not really see extreme problems occurring between deaf and hearing people. When I took this consortium class at George Washington University, which I mentioned earlier, I remember there were a few things that occurred that sometimes, communicatively, created a barrier, but overall, we are not really all that different, and I am seeing that, and I think that all of us, both deaf and hearing, when we come together in a room actually do pretty well.

Again, as I said, a lot of that, I was able to learn from my summer internship through Gallaudet.

Senator HARKIN. Yes?

Ms. HOHEUSLE. RIT and NTID have 13,000 students, 1,100 of whom are deaf at NTID and are cross-registered at RIT, and I am one of those students. I am taking science, and I am on the dean's advisory board specifically for the College of Science. There are 2 deaf people and 15 hearing people who come together every week to discuss a variety of different issues around science.

We have even had board meetings, and in these board meetings, I am seeing attitudes about deaf people improve, and improve not only specifically for deaf people, but the College of Arts and Sciences in general, and I am seeing how we can all come together and work together to resolve any issues which arise among administrators, faculty and staff. And I have really watched these interactions get better as we all come together; so I feel pretty prepared.

Ms. RAINONE. My final comment here, I really cannot emphasize enough, that we as unique individuals have a sense of belonging, have a sense of our own worth and a sense of our own personhood and a chance now, having been given that, to give back to others.

I do not think it is really helpful for us to be put in positions where resentment builds, but rather, to be put in environments where we can find out who we are, feel good about who we are, understand what it is we need, and then go out and make contributions to general society. I cannot emphasize that enough. And I think there are very few places outside of NTID and Gallaudet that can really provide those kinds of things for us, and I think that really the key here for me is that being at NTID has led to a better attitude.

Senator HARKIN. I want to ask a question related to that, and I was going to ask Mollie Easter from my home State of Iowa this question. You were the only deaf person in your high school. And listening to all of you talk, we know that young people who are deaf need good role models; they need to have the inspiration that

they, too, can achieve. They also need good teachers. Are any of you going to be teachers? We need some good teachers, too.

Mr. HAMILL. I want to be a coach.

Senator HARKIN. That is good, that is good. We need good teachers, and we need good role models. And for kids who are deaf who are the only kid in a school, or maybe there are two of them in a school—Mollie, did you feel at that time that you were given or that you had the opportunity to investigate and to pursue your own dreams without limitations?

Ms. EASTER. To be honest, for a long time, I thought of myself as some sort of hearing person on some level. I did not understand that I was deaf. And I think that as I became more and more involved with deaf people later on in my school life, I began to realize that I was different, and I also began to appreciate the importance of communication.

So I guess, yes, now I feel that more things are open for me than were.

Senator HARKIN. Yes, go ahead.

Ms. HOHEUSLE. I share Mollie's experience in being the only one in my high school who was deaf. I did get involved with the school newspaper and in sports, but I never really felt like I had any real confidence or support. I really did not feel like I had individuated. It did not happen for me, because I could not have really deep and meaningful conversations and communications with people.

NTID changed all that. I was able to have these communications, get to issues, get to the heart of things, and really, that is what made me a leader. I do not think my high school provided me with that. I do not think who I am really got to be until I was at NTID.

Ms. RAINONE. And again, if I could say, being Miss Deaf America, of course, I have to travel throughout the country, and I have also met a lot of deaf children. And when I see these kids, they make me realize what an enormous responsibility I personally have to them—to be a role model, to be there for them. There are so many kids who have asked me, "Is it possible me to be like you? Can I do this, can I do that?" Those remarks really touch me in such a deep place, because in my own experiences growing up, I wonder if I ever asked those questions myself—can I be "x"?

So I am starting to realize how much we need to understand and improve the world for them, to get them motivated so that they can pursue higher levels of education and so they can have the tools they need to get them through, because the kids are our and they are my future, and I want to do everything I can for these kids to get everything in place for them.

I do not think anyone really understands the impact of what we are doing and what these schools we are attending are all about until you see these kids. When you see them, you really, really see the significance of what we are doing.

Senator HARKIN. Mr. Chairman, one last, last comment.

The CHAIRMAN. No—that is all right. Please keep going.

Senator HARKIN. Good. Yes?

Mr. HAMILL. I too was one of the only deaf people in my high school. I was a three-time State champ. And at that time, the idea of going to the Olympics was never—you know, "What? I am going to do that?"

46-678 - 98 - 2

I was on the honor roll and so on, but my communication was always through writing with people, so I could never have a natural kind of communication. So it seemed that really, the only thing I was to the school I attended was a wrestler.

NTID changed everything for me. Not only did it open up the door with sports—true—but when I went through that door, it opened up another entire world for me, so NTID has been just invaluable to me as a result.

Senator HARKIN. Well, I have been involved with deaf students for 30 years, and I have got to tell you, it seems like every year, I am more and more impressed with how far you have come and how far you are going. It just does my heart good, and all I ask is that you continue to be role models. There are so many young kids out there who need to know, as you said, Ms. Rainone, that they can do what you have done. They need that inspiration, and they need that encouragement, and hopefully, through what we do here, we can provide those kinds of support services that will give them that encouragement.

So just keep on doing what you are doing, and just remember the special responsibility that you have, if I can say that to you as someone old enough to be your father or grandfather, to a lot of young kids in this country who are deaf and who really need the kind of inspiration that you can provide, and only you can provide. And if you will continue to remember that, then every year that I look out at the new class of students who are deaf, I will see even better and brighter and even more aggressive and more accomplished students.

Believe me, you are so far ahead of classes that I saw 10 and 20 years ago—it is just remarkable. So again, just keep up your pursuits and keep being role models for those young kids.

Thank you very much.

The CHAIRMAN. Thank you, Senator, for a very moving statement.

I want to say that some of us, as we get older, become more and more aware of what our problems are. You may notice that I myself wear two hearing aides. There are two things that I enjoy—one is being chairman of a committee in Congress, and the other is singing. I sing in a quartet, and sometimes I forget the hearing aides, and the other three members of the quartet look at me and say, "Jeffords, you did not wear your hearing aides. You are way off tone." So I suddenly have become very dependent on those hearing aides, and as the days go by, more and more so. My ears were blown out twice in military service, so I understand.

I would just say, Tom, why don't we forget the rest of the hearing and get the rest of the committee in here and just vote this bill out.

Senator HARKIN. That is right. I will get my proxies, you get your proxies, and we will just do it.

The CHAIRMAN. Thank you all for very, very compelling testimony. We look forward to watching your careers, and we will be watching the Olympics as well and cheering you on.

Thank you all so much. I cannot tell you how helpful your testimony has been.

The CHAIRMAN. I am now pleased to introduce our second panel. Dr. I. King Jordan, president of Gallaudet University, has been

providing excellent stewardship to that institution for which Federal funding was originally authorized in 1864 and supported by President Lincoln.

Dr. Robert DaVila is vice president of the National Technical Institute for the Deaf at Rochester Institute of Technology. Dr. DaVila was formerly assistant secretary of special education and rehabilitation service at the U.S. Department of Education under the Bush administration.

Dr. Jordan, please proceed.

STATEMENTS OF I. KING JORDAN, PRESIDENT, GALLAUDET UNIVERSITY, WASHINGTON, DC; AND ROBERT R. DAVILA, VICE PRESIDENT, NATIONAL TECHNICAL INSTITUTE FOR THE DEAF, ROCHESTER INSTITUTE OF TECHNOLOGY, ROCHESTER, NY

Mr. JORDAN. Good morning, Mr. Chairman, and thank you very much. Good morning, Senator Harkin. It is good to see both of you again.

I have a written statement that I would like to submit for the record, but I have a few comments that I would like to make at this time.

The CHAIRMAN. That is fine. Please proceed.

Mr. JORDAN. Almost exactly 10 years ago, I sat here before the Subcommittee on Disability Policy and testified for the first time. I had been president of Gallaudet University for about a week and a half. And for people who are used to testifying, maybe that is not a big deal, but I must tell you I was very nervous appearing before the committee, and I want to take one second to thank the chairman of that subcommittee, Senator Harkin, for his warm reception at that time.

I have been very fortunate in having a warm reception virtually every time I have testified since that time, and I am grateful for that baptism by fire in 1988, and it is very easy for me to follow those six outstanding students and their very positive testimony. I support the notion of the chairman, that maybe we should just set aside our testimony here and go ahead and pass the bill out.

It is hard to believe that we will be celebrating the 10th anniversary of DPN, the Deaf President Now movement, today. So many things have happened in 10 years, in the wink of a generation, that it is hard to look back and see what the world was like in 1988.

I will repeat the statement you made, Senator Harkin. I said then and believe very firmly now that deaf people can do anything except hear. We try to prove that every day.

DPN has changed the way that Gallaudet students feel about themselves and about their futures. The goals, aspirations and self-esteem that deaf people have now are different than they used to be. Today, Gallaudet graduates are doctors, lawyers, stockbrokers, business owners. Nearly 90 percent of our graduates hold professional, executive or management positions.

Gallaudet prepares deaf people to achieve the American dream. Thousands of deaf people throughout America are productive, taxpaying citizens because of the opportunities they received through a Gallaudet education. In fact, I have to say that I sit today next to a Gallaudet University graduate. Dr. DaVila graduated from

Gallaudet and went on to earn his Ph.D., became a vice president at Gallaudet and then, as you said, served as assistant secretary of education in the Bush administration.

Gallaudet is a national university serving a national need. Gallaudet is blessed with a long and rich history, and if I may give you a few highlights of our 140-year-long relationship with the Congress, I will do that.

You mentioned that Gallaudet first received funding in 1864. Actually, Gallaudet began prior to that and first received an appropriation in 1858. That appropriation has continued on an annual basis every year since that time. It was in 1864 that President Lincoln signed the authorization to provide baccalaureate degrees.

I might add here that a recent survey showed that 50 percent of the people who graduate from college and are deaf receive their degrees from Gallaudet.

In 1954, Congress changed the name to Gallaudet College and in 1986, Gallaudet University.

Since 1966, the University has had a legal mandate to develop and disseminate programs to improve the education of deaf children from preschool through 12th grade. Those activities are carried out by the national mission programs at the Model Secondary Schools for the deaf and the Kendall Demonstration Elementary School.

Two-thirds to three-fourths of the graduates from the Model Secondary School for the Deaf go on to college or university after they graduate. Our most recent alumni survey shows that less than 5 percent of our graduates are unemployed or looking for work at any time. Salaries of our alumni compare favorably with salaries of graduates from regular colleges and universities, and more than half of all Gallaudet graduates go on to earn advanced degrees. I want to repeat that and make sure it stands out in bold in the record, that more than half of the people who receive B.A.s go on and earn M.A.s or Ph.D.s. This compares to about 19 percent of college graduates from all over the United States.

The EDA Amendments of 1992 were directed primarily at reaffirming the missions of MSSD and KDES and at increasing the accountability of the University and its use of Federal funds. I have documented our responsiveness to the Amendments in my written statement, but will be very happy to respond to any questions you may have in that regard.

In general, I believe the University can operate effectively now under the provisions of the law, but there are four areas where I believe improvements can be made which will serve the interests of both the Federal Government and Gallaudet. I will mention briefly only two here, but the four are covered in my statement.

First, I would like to see the end of the 10 percent cap on admitting international students which was mandated in the 1992 Amendments. I can assure the members of this committee that at no time have qualified U.S. students been denied a place at Gallaudet to admit an international student. I can assure you further that that will never happen.

At the same time, the University loses about $1.5 million every year in tuition and fees because we are prohibited from enrolling an additional 5 percent of the international students who apply. At

the same time, the additional cost of educating them to Gallaudet would be very marginal. This $1.5 million is lost not only to the University but to the U.S. economy, because the tuition and fees originate overseas.

I can see no benefit at all to continuing the cap and urge you to remove it.

In 1992, Congress increased the University's flexibility in investing Federal endowment funds, and for that, I have been very grateful. Since the endowment matching program started in 1986, our endowment has increased nearly nine times, to about $88 million.

My written statement addresses a minor change in this area which I believe would allow us to increase returns and do even better in the growth of the endowment.

Thank you for your continuing commitment to quality higher education for deaf people. One last thing I would like to do is invite you and the other members of this committee to join Gallaudet and deaf people all over the country as we celebrate the 10th anniversary of Deaf President Now. We will be keeping you informed of activities, but one I want to mention especially is that on March 11, we will redo the historic march to the Capitol that happened on March 11, 1988. That was a day that changed the lives of deaf people all over the world, and we will be out in front of the West Front of the Capitol here on March 11th, 1998. I will be in touch with you, Senator, and Mr. Chairman——

The CHAIRMAN. I am sure you will. [Laughter.]

Mr. JORDAN [continues]. And hope that you can attend.

Thank you for this opportunity to appear before you, and I will be very happy to respond to any questions you may have.

The CHAIRMAN. Thank you, and thank you for all you have done, Dr. Jordan.

[The prepared statement of Mr. Jordan follows:]

PREPARED STATEMENT OF I. KING JORDAN

Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, I am pleased to appear before you today to testify in support of the reauthorization of Gallaudet University. I would like to begin by providing an historical perspective on the missions of Gallaudet University, the Model Secondary School for the Deaf and the Kendall Demonstration Elementary School. Gallaudet's long and unique relationship with the Federal Government began in 1857 with the enactment of legislation to incorporate as a school under the name of the Columbia Institution for the Deaf. In the following year, 1858, the institution received its first appropriation from Congress, and funding by direct appropriation has continued on an annual basis ever since. In 1864, President Abraham Lincoln signed into law an Act passed by the 38th Congress authorizing the institution to confer collegiate degrees. The rationale for this extraordinary action taken during the Civil War was that the deaf people of the United States could not participate fully in the institutions created by the Morrill Land Grant College Act. To provide for like participation, the Congress created Gallaudet as a national university for deaf people. In 1954, Congress enacted legislation that officially changed the name of the institution to Gallaudet College, the name by which it had unofficially been known almost from its inception.

Recognizing the need for improvement in the secondary education of deaf students in the United States, Congress, in 1966, authorized the establishment of a Model Secondary School for the Deaf (MSSD) on the campus of Gallaudet College to provide for the secondary education of persons who are deaf in order to prepare them for college and other advanced study, and to provide an exemplary secondary school program to stimulate the development of similarly excellent programs throughout the nation. In 1970, Congress passed legislation establishing the Kendall Demonstration Elementary School (KDES) to carry out a similar mission at the elementary school level. Finally, in 1986, the Education of the Deaf Act (EDA) changed the

name of the institution to Gallaudet University and reauthorized MSSD and KDES as parts of the corporate structure of the University. Further refinements were made to the EDA in the amendments of 1992.

The mission of Gallaudet University can be stated in very simple terms. For more than 130 years, it has been the only independent, comprehensive collegiate program in the world designed to meet the special needs of deaf students, and it continues to play a central role in the higher education of deaf people in the United States and around the World. According to a recent study, more than 50 percent of the deaf people known to have received bachelor's degrees in the United States in 1994 earned them at Gallaudet. Since late in the last century, Gallaudet has also trained teachers of the deaf and carried out research in areas of concern to the deaf population. Since 1966, the institution has had a legal mandate to develop and disseminate programs designed to improve the education of deaf students in programs below the collegiate level.

Because of Gallaudet University, deaf people have been able to participate fully in the American dream. According to recent surveys, compared to national norms for former college students, high percentages of Gallaudet alumni hold executive, professional, and managerial jobs; and the salaries of Gallaudet alumni compare favorably with those of college educated people generally. More than half of former Gallaudet undergraduates go on to earn advanced degrees, and the vast majority are productively employed during their postgraduate years in occupations appropriate to their level of education. At any given time, less than 5 percent of our graduates are not employed and seeking work. In addition, for more than a century, Gallaudet has provided educated leadership for an American deaf community that functions with an effectiveness generally unknown in the rest of the world.

Graduates of the Model Secondary School are also highly successful and productive. MSSD graduates consistently achieve reading scores approximately 2 grade levels higher than the average for deaf high school graduates nationally. Two thirds to three quarters of MSSD students go on to college or university after graduation, and less than 10 percent are neither working nor pursuing further education during the fall after they graduate. Some of the postsecondary institutions attended by recent MSSD graduates, in addition to Gallaudet University, are: Smith College, Georgetown University, Howard University, and Arizona State University.

As you know, Gallaudet University was last reauthorized in 1992, and I would like to bring you up to date on progress at the University since that time. Changes in the EDA that were introduced in the 1992 amendments were directed primarily at reaffirming the missions of MSSD and KDES as model and demonstration schools and on increasing the accountability of the University in its use of Federal funds. With respect to the latter, the EDA Amendments required that the University put into place policies prohibiting the use of Federal funds for some purposes and restricting their use for certain others. The Amendments required that these policies be submitted to the Department of Education for review and comment. The University completed this process within the time specified in the Amendments.

In addition, the University interpreted the intent of Congress in this regard to extend beyond these specific requirements. Accordingly, we have been closely reviewing all of our programs with the intent to make them more effective and efficient. We have also reduced the size of our workforce. Since we began a voluntary program of downsizing in 1989, we have reduced our staffing levels by more than 15 percent. We have accomplished this reduction in our workforce with a minimum of disruption to our programs. Indeed, in several areas our programs have become even stronger as a result of the administrative efficiencies we have been able to put into effect.

During the past two years, we have been reorganizing our university programs so as to make optimal use of resources. Restructuring has been focused in two major areas: the first two years of our undergraduate program and our deafness oriented research efforts. With respect to the first of these areas, we have created a School of Undergraduate Studies that has the goal of improving student success prior to the selection of a major. Included in this effort are developmental programs and an integrated program of first year studies. In addition, we have expanded our academic technology programs and increased resources devoted to faculty development and assessment.

The restructuring of research at Gallaudet has been completed. The major outcomes of this effort were the following: dissolving of many small theme-based centers, infusing research and theme-based researchers into academic departments so that students may benefit from direct contact with active researchers, encouraging directed and special project research by faculty and students with funds freed up by the reorganization, strengthening the support for university-wide research provided by the Gallaudet Research Institute, reallocating funds to other university

programs, and costsharing for grant programs. Excellent collaboration is occurring between the university and Pre-College National Mission Programs on several critical fronts.

The Pre-College National Mission Programs at Gallaudet consist of the Kendall Demonstration Elementary School (KDES), the Model Secondary School for the Deaf (MSSD), and the research, evaluation, and outreach activities associated with these schools. In accordance with requirements set forth in the EDA Amendments, we have implemented a process to obtain public input in the establishment of priorities for the research, development, and demonstration activities of the Pre-College National Mission Programs. We have now completed that process and have published priorities for distribution to the field of deaf education. These priorities are as follows: 1. Improvement of the literacy skills of deaf and hard of hearing students; 2. Improved education for the families of deaf and hard of hearing students; 3. Improved programs to facilitate the transition of deaf and hard of hearing students from secondary school to work or further education.

We have been testing and disseminating a program that addresses the first two of these priorities-literacy and the education of families. The project shows hearing parents how best to read to their children by using direct tutoring and videotapes. Through this technique, the amount and quality of parental reading to deaf children can be greatly increased. Many research studies have shown that levels of literacy achieved by children are highly correlated with the amount of reading their parents have done with them. During the past year, Pre-College National Mission Programs conducted a successful teleconference to disseminate this program to the general public, and more are planned.

The 1992 Amendments mandated that Gallaudet's Pre-College Programs, in the provision of its programs and services, should serve students with a broad spectrum of needs, including students who are lower achieving academically, who come from non-English speaking homes, who have secondary disabilities, who are members of minority groups, or who are from rural areas. The law also specified that services should be provided to students in a variety of educational environments, including: regular classes, resource rooms, separate classes, separate schools, and homebound or hospital environments. The Pre-College programs have reported on numbers of students served from these populations and have made special provisions for them in planning for programs and priorities.

The EDA Amendments also increased the University's flexibility in investing its Federal Endowment funds. The Federal Endowment Program was established by the original EDA in 1986 and provides Federal endowment funds to match funds that are contributed to Gallaudet's endowment from private sources. It is impossible for me to overemphasize the importance of this program to Gallaudet. Since this program was established more than a decade ago, the University's endowment has increased more than 8-fold to approximately $88 million. The original authorization restricted the investment of the Federal endowment funds essentially to government securities, while the 1992 Amendments extended our investment options to the Common Fund, allowing us to substantially increase our earnings.

After five years of operations under the Education of the Deaf Act as amended in 1992, I have a good sense of the strengths and weaknesses of the law as it affects the operations of Gallaudet University. In general, it has been my experience that the University can operate effectively under the provisions of the law as it exists now. There are however four areas in which I think improvements could be made that would serve the interests both of Gallaudet and the Federal Government. I will present discussions of each of these proposals below, including rationales and justifications for each proposed improvement.

Proposal No. 1. Removal of cap on international student enrollment

Section 210 of the EDA, as amended in 1992, contains the following provision: "Effective with new admissions for academic year 1993–94 and each succeeding academic year, the University (including preparatory, undergraduate, and graduate students) and NTID shall limit the enrollment of international students to approximately 10 percent of the total postsecondary student population enrolled respectively at the University or NTID." The same section goes on to impose a surcharge on the tuition rate for international students of 90 percent above the rate for U.S. students, with the exception that students from developing countries may have the surcharge reduced to 50 percent if they can demonstrate an inability to pay the full surcharge. The House Committee report on the 1992 EDA amendments explains the reasons for imposition of these restrictions on the enrollment of international students at Gallaudet and NTID in terms of the Committee's concern that existing needs of American deaf students were not being met while international students were apparently being subsidized with taxpayer dollars.

I recognize this concern as a legitimate one but would also like to point out several factors that might otherwise be overlooked as you and this Committee consider this issue during the reauthorization process. In 1992, I argued against a cap on international student enrollment for the following reasons: that it would unnecessarily reduce opportunities for higher education for deaf students from around the world, that it would reduce valuable contacts that our U.S. students might otherwise have with students from other countries and other cultures, and that because of the nature of our fixed costs and demographic trends in the U.S. deaf population it would reduce our income from non-Federal sources while neither reducing our costs nor opening up space for qualified U.S. students.

Since 1992, Gallaudet has accepted all qualified U.S. applicants, as it has always done, while reducing international student enrollment by approximately 100 students, from about 15 percent of total enrollment to about 10 percent, as required by the EDA amendments. If those 100 students had attended Gallaudet in 1996–97, they would have paid about $1 million in additional tuition to the University and about one half million in additional fees. As 100 students, representing less than 5 percent of the total enrollment in that year, could easily have been absorbed into existing classes, the additional cost to the University of educating them would have been negligible. I would also like to point out that the $1.5 million in income that was lost to Gallaudet in 1996 was also lost to the U.S. economy, as the tuition and fees paid by international students at Gallaudet originate overseas. From my perspective, then, the net result of the enrollment cap has been to deny or delay higher education to qualified deaf students from other countries, while it has cost the University substantial income which could have helped it to further reduce its dependence on Federal appropriations. I can see no benefit to anyone from this situation, and I seek your support for removing this obstacle to the higher education of members of the world deaf community who return to their countries and work to improve the lives of deaf people around the world.

Proposal No. 2. Increased flexibility in investing and matching Federal endowment funds

One of the great improvements introduced in the 1992 amendments to the EDA was the reduction in the restrictions on investment of Federal endowment funds. The original language authorizing this program in 1986 restricted investment of these funds essentially to relatively low-yield government securities. The 1992 amendments increased the investment options to include the Common Fund, and, given the outstanding performance of the equities market during recent years, this change in the law has proved a great benefit to the University. I would like to explore with the Committee possibilities for further expanding investment options for these funds, so that we could follow the same policy for investing Federal endowment funds as we do for our other endowments. The Gallaudet Board devotes considerable time to overseeing endowment investments in a prudent manner, and this change would improve the efficiency of our investment practices. In addition to increasing flexibility in investing the funds, we would also like to explore the possibility of changing the two-for-one matching requirements for amounts above $1 million. The change in the appropriation process that has enabled us to match more than $1 million in appropriated funds provides an incentive both for reducing operating costs and for our donors to increase their donations. These incentives would be increased if the matches were on a one-for-one basis at all dollar levels.

Proposal No. 3. Exemption from restrictions on re-employing annuitants

Current Federal law places restrictions on workers who are receiving Federal pensions. These restrictions are designed to prevent "double-dipping", so that retired Federal workers who return to do part-time work for the government have their salaries reduced accordingly. Gallaudet is in something of an unusual position in this regard. Because our employees are covered by the Federal retirement system, these restrictions on annuitants apply to retired Gallaudet employees who might similarly be re-employed here on a part-time or temporary basis. This is unusually difficult for us in that our employees must know sign language. Consequently, when we have short-term needs for specialized employees, retired employees are frequently perfect candidates, but the restriction on Federal annuitants is a disincentive to them to return to work for short periods. We would like to explore the possibility of adding language to the authorizing legislation that would give our retired employees relief from this restriction.

Proposal No. 4. Strengthening of language concerning private status of Gallaudet University

Although the current EDA makes it clear that the University is a private corporation, there are some circumstances in which this situation may still be ambiguous, especially when legal claims are made against the University. We would like to discuss possible changes in the language regarding Gallaudet's independent status in

its relationship with the Federal Government that would remove any ambiguity in this regard.

Mr. Chairman, I thank you for giving me the opportunity to testify before you today, and I will be happy to respond to your questions.

The CHAIRMAN. Dr. DaVila.

Mr. DAVILA. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I am pleased to appear before the committee. I thought it would be very important for me to be here, but after listening to our own students and Gallaudet's students, there is really very little reason for me to be here. They said it better than I could ever attempt to do. I am very pleased with them.

I am well into my second year as vice president of RIT, with responsibility for managing NTID, and I am pleased to tell you that NTID is accomplishing what our founding fathers envisioned the university would accomplish. We are also adapting to the principles laid down by the Commission on Education of the Deaf in 1988 and complying with the 1992 EDA Amendments.

One major activity that resulted from the EDA amendments is that NTID embarked on the development and implementation of a strategic plan. The plan focused all of our available resources on students, called for a complete reorganization of the institute, and prescribed a comprehensive and coordinated assessment and revitalization of NTID's academic programs and curriculum.

I am pleased to report to you that 75 to 80 percent of the initiatives called for by the plan have now been implemented, and the remainder will be implemented in the next one or 2 years.

We promised the Department and Congress that we would implement the strategic plan at no cost to the taxpayers. We are pleased to report to you that in fact we will be implementing the entire plan without an additional need for an increase in our appropriation.

Since 1993, as a result of our planning and reallocation efforts, we have reduced the number of administrative units from 13 to 6, eliminated seven academic programs that were least marketable and cost-effective, and downsized our employee base by 117 positions, or nearly 20 percent of our entire workforce, for a real cost saving of over $6 million. These savings allowed us to accommodate the combined effects of level or decreasing appropriations and increasing costs.

I hope these efforts, along with our responsiveness to the requirements of the 1992 EDA amendments, will give this committee confidence in our ability to provide good stewardship to NTID.

With all this as background, I would like to focus the remainder of my summarized comments on the provisions in the current EDA that we would like to see revised by the committee. I will focus my discussion on three proposals related to NTID's mission, international students and the matching endowment program.

With the first proposal, NTID is requesting more flexible language in its mission and purpose statement within the Act. The second proposes reconsideration of the present cap and surcharge provisions regarding the admission of international students. The third requests authority to use endowment income sooner than is now permitted by the Act.

First, we ask the committee to consider amending Section III authority to incorporate additional language that will more clearly

communicate NTID's multipurpose mission. NTID needs this legislative change so that it can maintain flexibility in responding to current and future developments in education and in the workplace. More detailed proposals with recommended wording changes are included in the complete testimony we have submitted for the record.

Basically, NTID's mission as envisioned by its founders has been to provide quality technical and professional education to persons who are deaf and hard of hearing, provide training and technical assistance to professionals in the field of deafness, undertake a program of applied research to investigate the social, economic and educational accommodation of deaf and hard of hearing people, and share our knowledge and expertise with external constituencies through outreach and technical assistance programs.

NTID has been doing this for many years, and we now need to restate our mission authority through more appropriate language that clarifies our mandated functions. For example, NTID offers a master's in science in secondary education program, which is the only one of its kind in the Nation. We all know there is a national shortage of certified secondary-level teachers in programs serving deaf and hard of hearing persons, especially in the critical areas of math and science.

In New York State, for example, there are only 43 teachers of the deaf who are certified to teach mathematics at the secondary level. There is only one certified physics teacher in New York State who is certified to teach deaf students at the secondary level; nine in chemistry, and 18 in biology. This is an alarming situation which was highlighted by the Commission on Education of the Deaf in 1988 and by the Council on the Education of the Deaf. We at NTID are fully aware of the seriousness of this situation as we continue to encounter high school graduates who are poorly prepared for college.

As I said, NTID's master's program is the only teacher education program in the United States whose sole focus is to prepare teachers of the deaf and hard of hearing to teach content at the secondary level. This is a fact that the Council on Education of the Deaf cited when it recently awarded NTID full accreditation for the program. I will submit the Council's citation for the record. While there are 53 teacher training programs for the deaf in the United States, there are simply not enough collectively to meet the Nation's needs, yet NTID remains the only certified program preparing teachers for secondary-level teaching.

These and other considerations lead us to request a change in our mission statement to clarify a role we have been playing all along.

My second proposal for your consideration is to amend Section 210, International Students, to remove the 10 percent cap on international student enrollment. In support of this proposal, NTID agrees to be held accountable that no qualified U.S. citizen will be denied entry.

We are not proposing changes to the current 90 percent surcharge imposed on international students, although the surcharge by itself poses a heavy financial burden on international students.

Finally, we would like to amend the language in Section 207, Federal Endowment Program, which currently restricts use of endowment income to that generated in the prior fiscal year. We would recommend changing "prior fiscal year" to "current fiscal year." The current language, while intended to preserve and build the corpus, has an unintended negative consequence. Although donors want to see timely tangible results from their gifts, only income from the prior fiscal year can be used under the current requirements. We suggest that if earnings are generated, they be spent for the intended purpose in a more timely way, so that donors more immediately see the results of their contributions.

In summary, for the last 28 years, nearly 95 percent of NTID's 3,700 graduates have been successfully placed in jobs commensurate with their training. Seventy percent are employed in business and industry. Research conducted by NTID and the Internal Revenue Service shows that our deaf graduates with bachelor degrees earn 93 percent of what their hearing peers earn. This is a much higher figure than the available data indicates for persons with disabilities in general.

In addition, a deaf graduate with a 4-year college degree in his or her lifetime will pay back over three times the cost of his or her education to the U.S. Treasury.

Thank you for this opportunity to report to you this morning.

[The prepared statement of Mr. DaVila follows:]

PREPARED STATEMENT OF ROBERT R. DAVILA

It is my distinct pleasure to appear before the committee on behalf of The National Technical Institute for the Deaf (NTID) at the Rochester Institute of Technology (RIT). NTID at RIT was created by Congress in 1965 as a national, coeducational, residential, education and research center for our Nation's deaf citizens. NTID provides educational programs directly for deaf students enrolled at NTID, and indirectly through academic programs, training workshops and seminars offered to professionals who serve deaf people nationally. When combined with the dissemination of information regarding NTID's research into the communications, personal/social, employment and educational aspects of deafness, this training permits NTID to have a positive impact on deaf education nationally and internationally.

Through the academic programs offered by the other colleges of RIT, deaf students pursue advanced technological studies assisted by a prominent faculty which serves RIT's more than 12,000 deaf and hearing students. This association with the Rochester Institute of Technology provides deaf students with access to more than 200 additional program offerings in the other six colleges of RIT.

I am well into my second year as Vice President for NTID, and I am pleased to report that the institution is accomplishing what the founders intended, adapting to the principles laid down by the Commission on the Education of the Deaf in 1988 and complying with the 1992 EDA Amendments, which were enacted while I was Assistant Secretary for the Office of Special Education and Rehabilitative Services. It is clear to me that NTID has complied with the spirit and intent of the 1992 EDA Amendments. At that time there were three major issues or requirements emanating from the Legislation. These were as follows:

1. It required the Department of Education and RIT to renegotiate the original Agreement that establishes NTID at RIT. NTID has made its recommendations to the Department and is awaiting a response.

2. It required NTID to develop a set of cost principles around eight specific cost objectives. NTID unilaterally expanded on this requirement to include all areas of cost, and as such, developed a comprehensive set of cost principles modeled after OMB Circulars A–21 and A–122. This 40 page document has been submitted to the Department and revised based upon their feedback. We are awaiting final approval from the Department, but I want to point out that we have been adhering to these principles since 1994. As the Department's former chief advocate for the establishment of these principles, I am extremely pleased with NTID's response.

3. It placed a 10 percent cap on international students and imposed a 90 percent surcharge on their tuition. I am pleased to report that since 1992, NTID's international student population has grown from 30 to 120, which is at the 10 percent cap.

In the former NTID Director's statement at the 1992 reauthorization hearing, he proudly spoke of a comprehensive strategic planning effort that was beginning at that time and which would involve hundreds of people at NTID and RIT, its National Advisory Group, the Department of Education and other constituent groups. The strategic plan focused our available resources on students, called for a complete reorganization of the institution, and prescribed a comprehensive and coordinated assessment and revitalization of NTID's academic programs and curriculum. I'm pleased to report that 75 to 80 percent of the initiatives called for by the plan have been implemented and the remainder will go on line in the next 1 to 2 years.

STRATEGIC PLAN IMPLEMENTED AT NO EXTRA COST TO TAXPAYERS

We promised the Department and Congress that we would implement our strategic plan at no extra cost to the taxpayers through reallocation of existing resources. We are pleased to report that the plan will, in fact, be implemented even though the increases in Federal funding during fiscal years 1995 to 1998 are negligible. Funding for this 3-year period actually represents a decrease because of our need to absorb increases due to inflation. However, our strategic plan provided us with a prioritized map for making the reductions necessary to balance our annual budgets while still achieving the prescribed changes.

We stand before this committee as a fiscally healthy and vibrant academic institution. We are well positioned for the year 2000 and beyond. We can do this in the face of major change and limited appropriation increases because we anticipated the current fiscal climate and initiated significant reductions in a measured way, while preserving our academic mission.

Since 1993, as a result of our strategic planning effort, we have reduced the number of administrative units from 13 to six, eliminated seven academic programs that were least marketable and cost effective and downsized our employee base by 117 positions, or nearly 20 percent of the workforce for a total savings of over $6 million.

Much of the monies saved from these activities went to balance our budget due to declining appropriations and inflation, while the rest was reinvested in our strategic plan. A summary of the most significant strategic initiatives that have been, or will be, implemented by the end of FY 1998 follows:

- Given the changing demographics of the student body and the emphasis on retention, NTID has implemented three new preparatory programs:
  1. First Year Experiences (Fall 1997),
  2. Career Exploration Studies (Fall 1997),
  3. Pre-Baccalaureate Studies (Fall 1997)
- In addition, to replace the academic programs that were closed, new academic programs and/or initiatives are in place or under development:
  1. Master of Science in Secondary Education for the Deaf (MSSE), (Fall 1995),
  2. Healthcare Billing and Coding Technology (Fall 1997),
  3. Laboratory Science Technology (Fall 1998),
  4. New Engineering-Related Technology Program (Fall 1998)
  5. Constructed 5,400 square foot Learning Center.

We have accomplished the goals set by our strategic plan, in spite of some rather difficult financial circumstances, and are doing so with 20 percent fewer employees. The House Appropriations Subcommittee on Labor, HHS and Education publicly complimented NTID on its actions to control costs in report language accompanying the 1996 Appropriations Bill. I hope these efforts, along with our responsiveness to the requirements of the 1992 EDA Amendments, give this committee confidence in our stewardship of NTID.

NTID PROPOSALS FOR THE 1998 EDA AMENDMENTS

With all the above as background, I would now like to focus the remainder of my comments on provisions in the current Education of the Deaf Act that we would like to see revised by this committee.

I believe that if these proposals are made part of the Act that they will greatly enhance NTID's ability to serve deaf and hard of hearing individuals more effectively and allow the Institute to continue its tradition of exceptional quality service. In general, I will focus my discussions on three proposals: NTID's mission, international students and the matching endowment program. One is related to the need for more flexible language in our mission and purpose statement within the Act; the second proposes re-consideration of the present cap and surcharge provisions regard-

ing the admission of international students; and, the third requests authority to use endowment income from the current fiscal year rather than wait until the following fiscal year.

MISSION REVISION

First, we ask that the Committee consider amending Sec. III Authority to read as follows (amended language in italics):

The institution of higher education with which the Secretary has an agreement under this title is authorized to operate and maintain a National Technical Institute for the Deaf *which may award certificates, diplomas, degrees and other academic credentials consistent with the host institution's programs, practices and policies for the purpose of——*

(1) providing deaf students with outstanding state-of-the-art technical and professional education programs, complemented by strong arts and sciences curricula, that prepares them to live and work in the mainstream of a rapidly changing global community and enhances their lifelong learning;

(2) preparing pre- and post-service professionals to work in fields related to deafness,

(3) undertaking a program of applied research designed to enhance the social, economic and educational accommodation of deaf people, and

(4) sharing its knowledge and expertise through outreach and other information dissemination programs.

It is important to spell out the full range of NTID's mission as the nation's premier technical and professional institution of higher learning serving persons who are deaf and hard of hearing. The four purpose statements listed above, and which are being proposed for inclusion in this amendment, are excerpted directly from NTID's mission statement, which is the central theme of NTID's Strategic Plan.

NTID needs this legislative change so that it can maintain flexibility in responding to current and future developments affecting postsecondary education and employment of persons who are deaf and hard of hearing. For example, we all know there is a national shortage of fully qualified teachers at the secondary level. According to the Department of Education in an October 1997 publication, Making Teaching a True Profession," . . . roughly one-fourth of newly hired teachers lack the qualifications of their jobs. . . . 23 percent of all secondary teachers do not have even a minor in their main teaching field." This phenomena is even more pronounced among educators of the deaf. In New York State, for example, there are only 43 teachers who are certified to teach mathematics at the secondary level to students who are deaf or hard-of-hearing. In the field of physics there is one; in chemistry there are 9; in biology there are 18; and so on. This is an appalling situation that was highlighted by the Commission on the Education of the Deaf in its 1988 report to the President and Congress, Toward Equality and by the Council on the Education of the Deaf. We at NTID know full well the seriousness of the situation, as we continue to encounter graduates of high school that are poorly prepared for college.

By way of example to highlight this critical problem, I recall when I was headmaster of the New York School for the Deaf before coming to NTID, we searched for two years to find a qualified science teacher. I even got a waiver from the state to pay well above the starting rate. However, we searched for two years to no avail.

Seventeen years ago, NTID established a Master of Science Program in Education in collaboration with the University of Rochester to train teachers of the deaf. In 1995, NTID assumed full responsibility for the program and revised and refocused it to prepare teachers specifically at the secondary level where the need was the greatest. It is the only teacher preparation program in the United States whose sole focus is to prepare teachers of deaf and hard-of-hearing students to teach content at the secondary-level, a fact the Council on the Education of the Deaf cited when it recently awarded NTID full accreditation for the program. At this point, we have only 5 hearing and 16 deaf or hard-of-hearing students in the program, but we are endeavoring to increase these numbers. While there are 53 teacher training programs for the deaf in the U.S., there are simply not enough to address the national shortage and only one, NTID's program, is certified at the secondary level.

The current language of Section III describes NTID as follows: "For the purpose of providing a residential, facility for postsecondary training and education for persons who are deaf in order to prepare them for successful employment, there are authorized . . . ." While this statement certainly describes our central mission, it does not encompass what the original legislators intended, nor does it describe how we have operated over the past 31 years, nor is it consistent with our strategic plan. The national issue that I described above is not implied in the language of the Act, but it is exactly the kind of issue our framers intended for NTID. A brief reading of *NTID: Policies, Guidelines and Applications Procedures,* The March 1966 call-for-

proposals document prepared by the then Health and Human Services Department, clearly spells that out. NTID's Eight Basic Responsibilities, a distillation of the HHS document, guided NTID on a path of vigorous outreach and training for the first 25 years of our history, and our more recent Strategic Plan: An Agenda for Action reaffirmed that direction.

In summary, the main elements of our mission need to be stated in the legislation to more accurately reflect NTID's various functions and responsibilities. NTID is more than just a college for deaf and hard of hearing individuals; it is a national demonstration center with responsibilities that go beyond the confines of its physical facilities and location. The Act should state that fact.

INTERNATIONAL STUDENT CAP

My second proposal for your consideration is to amend Section 210 (International Students) as follows (amended or deleted language in italics):

(a) ENROLLMENT.—Effective with the new admissions for academic year 1998–9 and each succeeding academic year, NTID *shall admit international students to the limit of its capacity, so long as no U.S. citizen is denied entry because of it.*

(b) TUITION SURCHARGE.—the tuition for postsecondary international students [*delete 'subject to the 10 percent cap"*] enrolled in NTID shall include a surcharge of 90 percent.

Section 210 currently places a 10 percent cap and imposes a 90 percent surcharge on international student enrollment at NTID (also imposed at Gallaudet University). Our experience with this restriction since its implementation during the 1993–94 academic year indicates that it has done an injustice to our nation's traditional service to deserving peoples of the world and has actually caused economic hardship for the Institute, because so much of our private endowment monies go to supporting students from third-world countries, who would not otherwise be able to afford the cost.

The cap and surcharge restrictions were imposed partially out of concern that deserving American students would be deprived of admission to NTID because international students could displace them. The Commission on Education of the Deaf, during its study of K–12 and postsecondary educational services for deaf and hard of hearing persons in 1986–88, raised this concern but had no tangible evidence to support its hypothesis. The fact is that since we began admitting international students in 1990, no single qualified United States citizen has ever been deprived of admission to NTID. Nor will any ever knowingly be, because we have procedures in place to prevent It.

NTID has a current facilities and human resource capacity to serve 1,150 deaf and hard of hearing students, which is approximately 70 students more than we are currently serving. The fact is that over the past several years, NTID has been very aggressively recruiting U.S. citizens. While their numbers have increased significantly since FYI 994, there are still not enough qualified U.S. citizens to maintain our deaf and hard of hearing student enrollment at capacity levels. The lifting, or increasing, of the 10 percent cap would allow us to meet our targeted capacity level and satisfy current international demand without infringing on the rights of any qualified citizen desiring to attend NTID.

International students provide a richness of individual and cultural diversity to any campus environment. On campuses serving deaf and hard of hearing students these interactions are especially sought and valued. While students from around the world also benefit from such an arrangement, it is a small price for American institutions to pay to enroll international students because of the goodwill it fosters for our nation and for the benefits derived by our students. There are only 2 institutions of higher education to which a deaf person from anywhere in the world can aspire to attend—those are the institutions covered in the Act.

These experiences lead to greater understanding of our global community and invariably contribute to a deeper appreciation for other cultures as well as our own. This is a vital part of a young person's education. Most certainly we consider this to be a win-win situation.

MATCHING ENDOWMENT PROGRAM

Lastly, we would like to amend the language in Sec. 207 Federal Endowment Program which currently reads as follows:

(d) Withdrawals and Expenditures

(3)(A) Except as provided in subparagraph (B), NTID may, on an annual basis, withdraw or expend not more than 50 percent of the income generated from its Federal endowment fund from the prior fiscal year.

We would recommend changing "prior" to "current" fiscal year in last sentence. The current language, while intended to preserve and build the corpus, has an unintended negative consequence. Donors want to see timely tangible results from their gifts. As the current language requires, earnings on a donation that is matched in

September, for example, cannot be spent until 13 months later, even though real earnings start to accumulate immediately. This is detrimental to our fund raising efforts. If earnings are generated they should be spent for the intended purpose in a timely way, so that the donor sees the fruits of his or her gift.

SUMMARY

For the last 28 years, nearly 95 percent of NTID's 3,700 graduates have been successfully placed in jobs commensurate with their training for the past 28 years. Seventy percent are employed in business and industry. Research conducted by NTID and the Internal Revenue Service (IRS) shows that our deaf graduates with bachelor degrees earn 93 percent of what their hearing peers earn. National statistics indicate that disabled workers earn only 70 percent of what their non-disabled peers in general earn. In addition, a deaf RIT graduate with a bachelor's degree, in his or her lifetime, will pay back to the Federal Treasury over three times the cost of his or her education in taxes alone. Obtaining a degree provides the individual with credentials that open doors to better jobs that provide not only higher wages and benefits, but also better working conditions. This improved compensation provides the college graduate better access to a variety of leisure time activities and a generally improved quality of life. Although the economic benefits of an NTID education are critical, these other more intangible benefits are equally important in making the graduate a truly contributing member of society.

Thank you for the opportunity to appear before this committee and I stand ready to answer any questions you may have.

The CHAIRMAN. Thank you both very much. I am going to cut down the questioning a little bit, because both of us have to leave. I have just had called a meeting of all the committee chairmen for 11:30, so I am going to ask you for very short answers or answers in writing, if that would be appropriate, so I can get to the next three witnesses and be able to make that meeting.

Dr. Jordan, does your institution do follow-up on its graduates, and how is the follow-up done? Could you give us a summary of that?

Mr. JORDAN. We follow up in two ways. We follow up every year, 1 year after people graduate, and then we have a larger survey of all people who ever attended Gallaudet about every 5 years, and they show very positive results. They show that virtually everyone is employed; 4 percent or less of the undergraduates are unemployed, and 2 percent of the graduate students are unemployed.

The CHAIRMAN. If you could provide us with more information on that, I think it is important for us to be able to help you all.

[The information referred to follows:]

Placement of Gallaudet Bachelor's Degree Recipients

Gallaudet University conducts periodic surveys to ascertain the status of graduates of its undergraduate programs. These surveys fall into two categories: 1. Short surveys designed to collect placement information concerning recent graduates—these are conducted annually and are targeted at students who graduated roughly one year prior to the time of the survey; 2. Comprehensive surveys of all former students conducted approximately every ten years. These two categories of surveys have somewhat different purposes and yield somewhat different results. This brief paper will first present a summary of the results of surveys of recent graduates that have been conducted during the past several years.

Surveys of recent graduates

For many years, Gallaudet University has surveyed graduates of its undergraduate programs approximately one year after their graduation. The University has asked graduates to respond to a typical battery of placement oriented questions related to such issues as employment status and further education. The table below summarizes information from the last four surveys concerning the status of bachelor's degree recipients at the time of the survey (generally in June of the year following graduation).

Gallaudet University

Placement Statistics
Bachelor's Degree Recipients

Year of Graduation	1995	1994	1993	1992
Placement Statistics				
At Time of Survey				
Number of Respondents	85	120	125	152
Attending Graduate School	38%	25%	30%	18%
Working				
Private Sector	22%	25%	30%	27%
Government	18%	11%	8%	12%
Education	45%	44%	34%	30%
Total Employed FT and PT	73%	75%	74%	76%
Other	17%	12%	11%	13%

Note that the category "other" in the table refers to former students who were neither working nor in school at the time of the survey and that the categories "attending graduate school" and "working" are not mutually exclusive. It should also be noted that the timing of the survey, in June one year after graduation, may bias the "other" category upward, in that some students may be just finishing a year of graduate school and be entering the job market at that time.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Another way of viewing the placement status of new bachelor's degree recipients is to ask them to report all of their activities during the previous year, not just at the time of the survey. The University reported these statistics for the first time with respect to students who received their bachelor's degrees in Academic Year 1994-95, and the following table summarizes this information.

Bachelor's Degree Recipients, 1994-1995

Activities Reported During First Year After Graduation

Further Education	38%
Employment	88%
Other	5%

This can be seen as giving a more complete picture of all the activities that these graduates engaged in during the first year after graduation.

Surveys of all graduates

Perhaps more important than the status of graduates during their first year after graduation is the pattern of their entire careers following their departure from the University. In order to assess this pattern, Gallaudet conducts surveys of all its bachelor's degree recipients approximately every ten years. The last such survey was conducted in 1993, and what follows is a summary of results from that survey for all students who received bachelor's degrees between 1923 and 1991.

- 55% of graduates responded to the survey
- At the time of the survey, 79% of graduates reported that they were working, 12% were retired, 5% were not working and not seeking work, and 4% were not working and were seeking work.
- 51% of all respondents hold graduate degrees at the master's or doctoral level, and an additional 11% attended graduate school but had not received a degree at the time of the survey.
- 66% of graduates were employed in executive, professional or managerial occupations, and an additional 17% were employed in technical, sales or administrative support.

These results are very positive when compared to statistics from a national survey of holders of bachelor's degrees.

The CHAIRMAN. When you seek to admit a qualified international student, how do you determine from the information you receive that that student has the qualifications that would be required from a U.S. student? If you can respond to that in writing, it would be appreciated.

Mr. JORDAN. Certainly.

The criteria that we use to admit international students are the same that we use to admit American students. We check for the applicant's knowledge of English and competency to do college level work as demonstrated on the Test of English as a Foreign Language (TOEFL) or such standardized tests as ACT and SAT, which must reflect scores in the 45th percentile. Standardized test scores are accepted if the grade equivalency test results are provided with the results.

The CHAIRMAN. And would you also elaborate on why you seek the clarification of the law of Gallaudet's corporate status, and provide us that response for the record.

Mr. JORDAN. You asked if there is more interest in [Gallaudet University programs in training teachers for deaf and hard of hearing students] than there has been in the past? When I responded, "We are at capacity," please understand that I was referring to the local fieldwork placement challenges for the 103 *graduate students* in our eight fully accredited *graduate* Education of the Deaf Programs. You will be pleased to know that 44 percent of these graduate students are deaf people, an all-time record. The success of our graduate education programs is due, in part, to our highly rated *undergraduate* education program which now includes 101 deaf students majoring in education. The *average* GPA of these deaf undergraduates in education is 3.2. Every one of these deaf undergraduate education majors is trained in a specific content area (e.g., science, math, social studies) and does field work placement teaching that subject to hearing students. The term capacity also refers to the ongoing challenges we face in finding and paying for qualified interpreters to work with our deaf students during their practice teaching, but we are working to implement the *promises* made in the Americans with Disabilities Act. No other program in the United States is providing this kind of leadership. Our capacity is also determined by the limited job market for teachers of the deaf with very modest teacher salaries. We know this is an issue of concern to all the 70 existing teacher training programs in education of the deaf in the United States.

Simply stated, the response to your question about "more interest" is an emphatic YES!

You inquired about the interest level of hearing students in our graduate programs in education. Hearing graduate students interested in teaching deaf children know they get the best possible preparation at Gallaudet University, the *only* 100 percent signing environment in higher education with model elementary and secondary school programs for deaf children on campus. Prospective education of the students, deaf or hearing, also recognize the enormous benefits of studying on the unique Gallaudet campus that also trains school counselors, school psychologists, audiologists, social workers, school researchers, and school administrators. We *model* the kind of collaboration the Congress envisioned in the re-

cent IDEA Amendments. These kinds of collaborations are available *only* at Gallaudet University.

Gallaudet University is number one in generating highly qualified deaf and hearing teachers of deaf and hard of hearing students. Our NCATE accreditation qualifies Gallaudet-trained teachers for certification in *41* States at a time when a majority of *all* teacher training programs in the United States are accredited *only* by their home States. We expect to continue to meet the needs of the residential and mainstream school marketplaces.

The CHAIRMAN. Dr. DaVila, this committee understands that the department is not willing to allow you to use Federal funds to support master's degree programs in secondary education for the deaf. Could you give me a little bit on that and then amplify it in writing, if you could?

Mr. DAVILA. We have prepared a discussion document on that subject, and I would be happy to submit that for the record.

The CHAIRMAN. The witness who is coming up is from the Department of Education, and so I would like to have you give a short response now.

Mr. DAVILA. Very well. Thank you, sir.

NTID has been involved in secondary education for 16 years, preparing teachers for that level of teaching for 16 years. Originally, it was a joint program with the University of Rochester, and after a while, the University of Rochester decided not to continue to participate in the program. So the program was moved entirely to RIT, and it was taught by NTID teachers at NTID.

The Department's interpretation of admission is very limited, and therefore, it does not include authority to prepare pre-service teachers of the deaf, although we are involved in providing training for teachers already in service. We are very concerned about the lack of sufficient numbers of teachers certified to teach at the secondary level.

I speak from the heart on this one. I am a certified mathematics teacher. I began my career as a high school math teacher, and I can see the dire need in the country that NTID can meet. Of course, NTID alone and all the other 53 colleges now providing training for teachers of the deaf could not collectively meet that need, but we see an opportunity for us to make important contributions.

The CHAIRMAN. Thank you. We have other questions that we will submit to you in writing.

[Questions from Senator Jeffords follow:]

RESPONSES OF MR. DAVILA TO QUESTIONS ASKED BY SENATOR JEFFORDS

Question 1. When you seek to admit a qualified international student, how do you determine that the information you receive meets the same qualification standards that must be met by U.S. students?

Answer 1. Let me begin by reviewing the documentation that all students, United States and international, must present in order to be considered for admission to NTID:

- Deafness: 70 decibels hearing loss unaided (ANSI, 1969) or greater across the 500 and 2000 hertz range.
- Graduation from an accredited secondary school.
- Strong letters of reference relevant to academic achievement and potential.
- Strong standardized test results.

In addition, for international students where English is not their first language, applicants must possess an eighth grade equivalent of English as measured by the

Test of English as a Foreign Language (TOEFL). Other differences are mainly found in the process of evaluating the requested documentation, particularly audiograms, school transcripts and degrees attained. For international students we go through a secondary review process with a staff person who is skilled in reviewing such international documents as certificates and grading systems to assist us in determining equivalences to our admissions criteria.

Question 2. What percentage of applicants do you turn away each year, and on what basis?

Answer 2. Approximately 30 percent of the applications are turned away each year for the following reasons:

1. The applicant does not meet the Institute's audiological criteria.
2. The applicant has not completed an educational program equivalent to a U.S. high school.
3. The applicant has not provided high enough standardized test results or has not provided *any* standardized test results in support of the application.

Question 3. If there were to be another Commission on the Education of the Deaf, what areas would the school like to see studied?

Answer 3. There are numerous issues in need of the in-depth type of review and analysis that could be carried out by a new Commission on the Education of the Deaf. The following list is not intended to be all inclusive and as such it demonstrates that a re-constituted group would have a difficult time selecting the priorities which would serve as their agenda.

- The impact of post-secondary education upon the economic well being of graduates. (Earnings, removal from SSI roles, etc.)
- Potential impact of technology on the teaching/graduation rates (COED reported in 1988 that 70 percent of A.A.S. and Bachelor's level candidates did not receive their degrees).
- Quality and breadth of support services being provided to post-secondary students in integrated settings.
- Need for national (or State-by-State) certification standards serving deaf persons in academic settings (K-College).
- Development and implementation of standard curricula and outcomes measures for sign language and interpreter-training programs.
- Study of the feasibility of establishing a national center on research on employment and employment-related issues facing deaf and hard of hearing persons.
- The need for a broad-based program of research on the efficacy of interpreter services in various settings with varying age groups.
- The need for a program of research focused on exceptional deaf individuals and the perceived factors contributing to their success.
- Longitudinal studies of language development in individuals using various modes of communication (e.g., oral, cued speech, various modes of sign language.).
- Report on the implementation and effectiveness of the Secretary of Education's policy guidance on programming for deaf children (October 30, 1992) and determination and removal of obstacles impeding it's implementation.
- Survey and assessment of effectiveness of IDEA transition plan requirements for deaf and hard of hearing youth.
- Study and assessment of certification and training qualifications of teachers of the deaf in both special school and mainstreamed settings.

I trust this information is helpful to Chairman Jeffords and the committee. Please let me know if I may be of further assistance.

The CHAIRMAN. I appreciate your testimony very much, and I want to commend you for all that you are doing. Both of you have been incredible examples of success, and I deeply appreciate your testimony.

Thank you very much.

Senator Harkin.

Senator HARKIN. I just want to commend you as the chairman has just done, for taking both schools and really moving them ahead greatly.

I just have a couple of questions, one dealing with the surcharge and the cap. Before the cap was put on, isn't it true that neither NTID nor Gallaudet had to turn away any U.S. students for a foreign student? That never happened, did it?

Mr. JORDAN. That is true. We never denied access to an American student to admit a foreign student; never.

Senator HARKIN. Exactly. But as you pointed out, over 100, I think, or 150 students have not been able to attend Gallaudet because of this cap; but you have the capacity to absorb them.

Mr. JORDAN. Yes, Senator. One hundred students would represent about 5 percent of our total enrollment, so it would be easy to just integrate them into the classes that are presently offered, and there would be no large additional cost to the university.

Senator HARKIN. Let me ask both of you if we got rid of the cap, but you still have the 90 percent surcharge—that is quite a financial burden—how should that be modified, if at all, the surcharge?

Mr. DAVILA. We have no intention whatsoever to cut enrollment on international admissions. There is no record anywhere that an American was ever rejected for admission purposes. They do bring very important value to the institute. I agree with you, the 90 percent surcharge is enormous, and it is a heavy burden, especially on Third World applicants. I would see us providing a guarantee that no American will ever be denied admission as a protective measure.

Senator HARKIN. Was there a surcharge before 1992?

Mr. JORDAN. No surcharge, no, sir.

Senator HARKIN. I did not think there was.

Mr. JORDAN. No. The surcharge was added with the EDA Amendments of 1992. This year at Gallaudet University, tuition is $6,000—$6,003, to be exact. International student tuition is $11,400 or so. So it is really a large burden, and during the semester break, some students from highly-developed countries, Japan, for example, had to go back home because the economies at home were such that they could not continue to afford the tuition burden.

Yes, I agree, the surcharge is a large burden to those students.

Senator HARKIN. Mr. Chairman, I really believe—I remember when this came through in 1992, and I am sure you do, too; we had some pretty stiff battles with the other body on that one—I would hope that we could reexamine this whole area of the surcharge and the cap.

I was just asking my staff—we have a lot of foreign students attending Iowa State University, from which I graduated, which is a land-grant university which gets a lot of Federal money, and they do not have to pay a surcharge like that. If I am not mistaken, I think all they pay is the equivalent of out-of-State tuition, whatever that is, to go to Iowa State; but there is no big surcharge.

It would seem to me that that kind of approach would be logical for these two institutions also. I know the argument is that, well, the Government gives you all this money, and why should we subsidize foreign students, but we do that at every land-grant college in the United States. We do it at every college. Every college gets Federal money one way or another, for research programs, support programs; money is fungible. So foreign students come there, and they do not have to pay that kind of surcharge, and I do not see why they have to pay it here, either.

I would hope we could really take a look at that and get it to some equivalency with what a foreign student would have to pay

to go to the University of Vermont or the University of Iowa or anywhere else.

Mr. JORDAN. I would urge the committee to look at the Howard University model, for example. I do not believe they have to charge additional tuition to their international students.

Senator HARKIN. I do not know; do they?

The CHAIRMAN. I do not know, either. We have someone who may be able to answer that question.

Mr. DAVILA. It is a fact.

Senator HARKIN. The second part of my question—and I know the chairman is in a hurry, and so am I; we will have to leave—you heard me talk with these young students here about teachers, and Bob, in your statement, you mentioned the lack of teachers in science and physics and chemistry in New York.

You have a certified teaching program at Gallaudet, Dr. Jordan, and you——

Mr. JORDAN. Yes. We prepare teachers at every level, from elementary school, secondary school. We prepare math and science teachers at the secondary school level, yes, sir.

Senator HARKIN. Yes, you do that. Do you do that at NTID? I am a little confused on this issue.

Mr. DAVILA. Yes, we do. We prepare teachers only for high school-level teaching. We do not prepare elementary school teachers. And there are not enough now in terms of numbers all over the country. We need more teachers at the secondary level. Gallaudet alone cannot do that, and between us, we cannot do it by ourselves alone. We need more, so that is why we need to move in that area.

Senator HARKIN. Maybe I can follow this up in personal conversations, but how many hearing students, Dr. Jordan, roughly, do you have each year who come to Gallaudet to prepare for the teaching of students who are deaf—that is, hearing people who come there?

Mr. JORDAN. I will have to be careful and submit that for the record to be sure that number is exactly right.

Senator HARKIN. Fine. Is it getting larger, or has it stayed the same? I guess I am wondering if there is more of an interest in it now than there has been in the past.

Mr. JORDAN. We are at capacity. We enroll all the students we can handle at the graduate level in our teacher preparation program. So it is not a question of the program growing; it a question of constraints on our ability to handle the students.

Senator HARKIN. I would be interested in knowing if you have more applications coming in than you are able to handle.

Mr. JORDAN. I would be very happy to get you detailed information on that for the record.

Senator HARKIN. I would like that. Some things tell me—I have noticed little bits and pieces indicating more of an interest of teachers wanting to learn not only sign language, but the deaf culture, to be able to better teach deaf students. I am just wondering if you are seeing that happen at your university—that is, more applications, more people wanting to come there.

Mr. JORDAN. There is definitely more interest, yes, sir.

Senator HARKIN. There is more interest; I know that. We need to do something here to accomplish that, so let me know.

Mr. JORDAN. All right.

[Information of Mr. Jordan follows:]

RESPONSE OF MR. JORDAN TO A QUESTION ASKED BY SENATOR HARKIN

Question. If there were to be another Commission on Education of the Deaf, what areas would the school like to see studied?

Answer. We believe it would be wise to give the Kendall Demonstration Elementary School and Model Secondary School time in which these programs can address the national mission as mandated by the EDA Amendments of 1992 and then see what the field is like in 10 years. Perhaps another study would be warranted at that time.

Senator HARKIN. Dr. DaVila.

Dr. DaVila. I want to say that our program has only 16. The tuition charge is over $18,000, because we cannot include that program in our appropriation, and that is a disincentive for applications to help students who are deaf. But we cannot expand that program to meet the national need, or even meet the need in New York State alone, because of the prohibitive cost.

Senator HARKIN. I think, Mr. Chairman, without belaboring the point, that we really have to look at what we have to do with both of these institutions to accommodate what I believe is a growing interest out there among hearing teachers who want to learn how to teach deaf students.

The CHAIRMAN. I understand.

Senator HARKIN. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. Thank you very much.

Thank you both, and as I said, we will be back in touch with you and look forward to your answers, and we will probably have further questions for you.

The CHAIRMAN. As our next witness, we are fortunate to have Ms. Judith Heumann, assistant secretary for special education and rehabilitative services at the U.S. Department of Education. Ms. Heumann has been before this committee numerous times during her tenure as assistant secretary. She and her staff have provided useful and timely technical assistance during our reauthorization of the Individuals with Disability Education Act in 1997 and during our current efforts to reauthorize the Rehabilitation Act.

Ms. Heumann, please proceed.

STATEMENT OF JUDITH HEUMANN, ASSISTANT SECRETARY FOR SPECIAL EDUCATION AND REHABILITATIVE SERVICES, U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION, WASHINGTON, DC, ACCOMPANIED BY CAROL CICHOWSKI, DIRECTOR, SPECIAL EDUCATION, REHABILITATION AND RESEARCH ANALYSIS DIVISION, AND RAMONE RODRIGUEZ, LIAISON OFFICER FOR SPECIAL INSTITUTIONS

Ms. HEUMANN. Would you like me to skip the testimony so you can just get into questions and answers? I can submit the testimony for the record, but I can proceed as you wish.

The CHAIRMAN. All right. Well, I am ready.

The EDA requires the Department to conduct monitoring and evaluation activities of the education programs and activities and the administrative operations at Gallaudet University and NTID.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Please describe these types of oversight activities the Department has conducted.

Ms. HEUMANN. OK, Mr. Chairman. Let me first also introduce the two people who are at the table with me. To my left is Carol Cichowski, who is with the undersecretary's office and is director of the Division of Special Education and Rehabilitation Analysis, and to my right is the liaison officer for special institutions in the Department, Ramone Rodriguez, who works in my office.

The CHAIRMAN. We welcome both of you here also.

Ms. HEUMANN. I will begin to answer that question, and Ramone will finish answering that particular question. Over the last number of years, I think we have been developing a very strong and collaborative relationship with NTID and with Gallaudet in the area of oversight and monitoring, and I think it has been a very fruitful relationship which has enabled us to collaborate more effectively together and also to facilitate the implementation of certain provisions, new provisions, like the integration of IDEA into the Education of the Deaf Act.

The CHAIRMAN. OK.

Mr. RODRIGUEZ. We have access to the office of the president of Gallaudet University and the vice president at RIT, to meet with them and discuss issues of mutual interest, and also the budget process. We are able to review and monitor the activities of both institutions.

In 1992, with the amendment of EDA, we are also responsible for including Part B of the Individuals with Disabilities Act and to ensure that the demonstration programs are in compliance with those regulations.

We have full responsibility for monitoring the National Missions Programs at Gallaudet University which are directed by demonstration schools, and we have quarterly meetings with the vice president of that program. Also, as liaison officer to those institutions, I sit as ex officio on the National Missions Advisory Board, and at the National Technical Institute, I also serve on the National Advisory Board. At Gallaudet, I am always ready and prepared to attend their meetings at their invitation.

Ms. HEUMANN. I have also since I have been in this office had the opportunity to visit both Gallaudet and NTID and have found both of the institutions to be really moving ahead in relationship to academics. I recently visited NTID, and I was really very impressed with the level of technology and the involvement that was going on between the business community and students and faculty at the university.

Gallaudet has been most open and receptive. I spent a number of hours with Jane Fernandez who is over Kendall School and MSSD, where they came in to talk to us about their goals and objectives. So I think it has been very constructive, and I believe the monitoring efforts that we have been involved in have really been fruitful to improve the quality of services at both schools.

The CHAIRMAN. Thank you.

The Government Performance and Results Act requires all Federal agencies to develop performance plans for programs receiving Federal funds. What key indicators will the Department be using to monitor the performance of Gallaudet and NTID?

Ms. HEUMANN. Well, amongst the ones that we are currently working on are issues in the area of retention rate, graduation rate and placement rate. I think these are three very critical issues to looking at the progress and results for students.

And in the area of MSSD and Kendall School, we are looking at the issue of diverse enrollment. The 1992 Amendments of the ADA had broadened the mandate for elementary and secondary programs at Gallaudet, and a key indicator for these programs will be the extent to which MSSD and KDES are serving students with a broad spectrum of needs.

We are also going to be working in the area of general curricula, high standards, and assessment-related issues, because I think these are three critical issues to be looking at in order to assure that particularly education for primary and secondary students is commensurate with the education for nondisabled students.

The CHAIRMAN. Senator Harkin?

Senator HARKIN. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Madam Secretary, what is the Department's position on the cap on international students?

Ms. HEUMANN. The Department's position on the cap has been that we have supported the 10 percent cap with the 90 percent surcharge, and we are very aware of the issues that both universities have been raising in relationship to increasing the cap and certainly would be willing to talk with you about the increase of the cap. But we would also argue that in the event that there were an increase in the cap, there should be a look at an increase in the surcharge.

Senator HARKIN. An increase in the surcharge?

Ms. HEUMANN. An increase in the surcharge.

Senator HARKIN. Above 90 percent?

Ms. HEUMANN. Above 90 percent if we would be increasing the cap.

I would like to State that while we recognize that both universities are committing to not accepting foreign students over U.S. students, I do not think that that is the only direction of concern that we should be looking at.

The students who testified here earlier this morning talked about a full array of services that they need in order to be able to effectively participate in their respective universities, and all of the students, the U.S. students and non U.S. students, are being heavily subsidized right now. I think there are other ways that we could be looking at utilizing dollars on campuses for students, including improvements in technology, upgrading of facilities, improvements in curricula, and so on.

I certainly heard the comments that you were making earlier and would be more than wiling to engage in a longer discussion with you on that, but at this point, we are not supportive of removal of the cap.

The CHAIRMAN. We are both interested in that. With the logic that they provided as to why a small increase would be so advantageous, it is difficult—but we will follow through on that.

Senator HARKIN. Yes, we will definitely follow through on that.

I know you are recommending a name change, and I did not mean to get into that here today, but I will; I might as well lay

down some markers here. I am not so certain—Madam Secretary, you and I have disagreed very seldom on anything. I would like to discuss further with you, if not here, then at some other appropriate time--and I know we do not have the time here today—this issue of the name change. I am not certain that we want to limit the Education of the Deaf Act or to constrict it by a name change that really narrows the focus greatly.

I understand how it came about, and I understand the Education of the Deaf Act. I was here when it went through; I sat right here in this committee. And I was here for the 1992 Amendments, too. But we are expanding perhaps a little bit of what the Education of the Deaf Act means, and some of my questioning this morning indicates, I hope, a desire to start expanding it a little bit more than it has been in the past. Because of the necessity to provide more options and choices, to provide more role models to—well, as you mentioned, Madam Secretary, in your written statement, the President has said that we need to make higher education more accessible as well as lifelong learning. Well, if that is the case, then I would submit that perhaps we have to look at the Education of the Deaf Act and how it is going to meet that goal also. And I would not want to constrain it with words that give it a focus that makes it hard to break out of later on.

Ms. HEUMANN. Senator Harkin, if you expand the scope of the Education of the Deaf Act, then the suggestion that we are making would not be appropriate. But under the current EDA, the reason why we have suggested the change is because currently, the EDA in fact does focus its attention on these two universities.

Now, the issue of deafness is certainly covered significantly in other pieces of legislation, like in the IDEA, and I think we even gave the issue of low incidence, which includes deafness and hard of hearing, a stronger focus with the reauthorization, as for blindness and low vision.

So I think that if you look at the array of programs that the Government in fact provides, issues affecting deaf and hard of hearing students are addressed in many areas. So again, as I said in the beginning, if the intent is to broaden the EDA, then the change would be inappropriate; but if in fact we are going to maintain our focus within this specific piece of legislation on Gallaudet and NTID, that was the reason we recommended the change.

Senator HARKIN. I would be willing to discuss it further, but my initial reaction is one of not really being—yes, we will discuss it further. Thank you very much.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. Thank you, and I assure you we will be back in touch with you; you do not have to worry about that.

Thank you.

[The prepared statement of Ms. Heumann follows:]

PREPARED STATEMENT OF JUDITH E. HEUMANN

Mr. Chairman and members of the committee: Thank you for the opportunity to appear before this Committee to express the Administration's full support for reauthorization of the Education of the Deaf Act (EDA) of 1986. This Act authorizes funding for Gallaudet University and the National Technical Institute for the Deaf (NTID).

The President has emphasized universal access to postsecondary education and lifelong learning as top priorities of his Administration. This access is needed because today's good jobs increasingly require skills and training beyond a high school education. This means that effective and accessible postsecondary education is critically important. I am pleased to be here today because Gallaudet and NTID provide important postsecondary educational options to assist individuals who are deaf to obtain the skills necessary to succeed in today's competitive job market and global economy.

Role of the Department of Education

Under the EDA, the Department of Education is responsible for monitoring and providing oversight to Gallaudet and NTID to help ensure that services and programs are being provided in accordance with the authorizing legislation and that these activities meet the needs of the students for whom they are intended. For fiscal year 1997, the Federal appropriation provided approximately 72 percent of total revenue for Gallaudet University, (including 97 percent of the total estimated funding for the elementary and secondary education programs), and 82 percent of total revenue for the National Technical Institute for the Deaf. This amounts to a combined Federal appropriation of $122 million for these two institutions. The size of the Federal appropriation and its significance to these institutions as a source of revenue reflect the clear Federal interest in the efficiency and effectiveness of their operations.

The Department has been working with Gallaudet and NTID to develop performance plans that meet the requirements of the Government Performance and Results Act of 1993 (GPRA). The draft plans are based on the strategic planning documents developed by each institution and include strategic objectives and performance indicators that can be used to help measure the effectiveness of Gallaudet and NTID programs. We are pleased with the collaborative process we established with each of the institutions and believe that the final plans will help provide concrete, measurable data on the progress of each school in meeting the mandates of the EDA.

Need to Maintain Progress Made in the 1992 Amendments

The Education of the Deaf Act Amendments of 1992 incorporated a number of important changes into the Act that were recommended by the Department and the Commission on the Education of the Deaf. These include provisions for updating the operating agreements for NTID and Gallaudet's elementary and secondary education programs; establishing limitations on the expenditure of Federal funds; setting a 90 percent tuition surcharge for international students; and setting a limit on the number of international students that can be accepted and subsidized by the schools. The amendments modified the Endowment Grant provisions to increase investment options and expanded the requirements for annual reports by the Institutions. The amendments also incorporated procedural safeguards specified in the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) into the requirements for Gallaudet's elementary and secondary education programs; broadened the mission of those programs to serve students with a broad spectrum of needs including students who are lower achieving academically, who are from non-English-speaking homes, who have secondary disabilities, who are members of minority groups, or who are from rural areas. A requirement was placed on the elementary and secondary education programs to conduct model demonstration activities in an equitable manner based on the distribution of students who are deaf or hard of hearing among various educational environments. In addition, the 1992 amendments added a provision which requires the demonstration schools to establish and publish priorities for research, development, and demonstration through a process that allows for public input. The legislative changes to the elementary and secondary education programs at Gallaudet helped ensure that all individuals with deafness benefited from the demonstration activities conducted by these programs. We believe that the EDA was substantially improved in the 1992 reauthorization, and that those changes helped increase the accountability and focus of Gallaudet and NTID. The Department has worked closely with the Institutions over the past several years to ensure effective implementation of the requirements of the EDA. For example, the 1992 amendments incorporated provisions of the IDEA related to students who have been placed in Gallaudet's elementary and secondary education programs by their parents. The Department began monitoring Gallaudet's compliance with these provisions in 1994 and provided extensive technical assistance to the University to bring it into compliance with the law. Additional technical assistance sessions are currently being conducted with the administrators of the elementary and secondary education programs to apprise them of the 1997 Amendments to the IDEA. In addition, the Department

and Gallaudet successfully renegotiated the agreement for the operation and demonstration activities of the elementary and secondary schools, as required by the Act. We strongly believe that nothing should be done to weaken the Act's current direction. The current law is a good law, and it does not need to be substantially amended.

Outside Input Into Research Priorities

While we are not proposing major changes to the EDA, we have several recommendations for changes which we believe would add strength and clarity to the current legislation. For example, as I mentioned earlier, the 1992 Amendments included a provision that requires Gallaudet's elementary and secondary education programs to establish and publish priorities for research, development, and demonstration through a process that allows for public input. The University and NTID currently utilize the advice and input from their respective research advisory groups. However, the Department believes that research the institutions plan to carry out in the area of deafness, such as research on the education of students who are deaf or hard of hearing or the employment of individuals who are deaf or hard of hearing, would greatly benefit from more comprehensive input by the public on a regular basis. We recommend that the EDA be revised to incorporate provisions requiring Gallaudet University and NTID to share their deafness-related research agendas for review and comment by the public, including consumers, constituent groups, and other federally-funded programs.

Research Reports

As part of the research effort at both of the Institutions, the Department further recommends that a provision be added that would require Gallaudet and NTID to submit an annual research report to the Secretary which would provide a summary of the public input received in addition to summary descriptions of research projects being conducted by the Institutions, project periods for the research, related funding, products resulting from the research, and a summary of the dissemination of the products and/or research results.

The opportunity to review and comment on the Institutions' research agendas, as well as the opportunity to review the Institutions' annual research reports will assist our Liaison Officer to carry out his responsibility under section 206(b) (2) of the EDA which specifies that the Liaison Officer shall "review research and other activities carried out by the University, NTID, and other Federal or nonFederal agencies, institutions, or organizations involved with the education or rehabilitation of individuals who are deaf or hard of hearing for the purpose of determining overlap and opportunities for coordination among these various entities".

Title Change

The Department further recommends a change in the title of the "Education of the Deaf Act." We are concerned that the title of the Education of Deaf Act has caused some confusion in the deaf community as to the purpose of the Act. In 1986, the EDA was enacted to consolidate the separate authorities for Gallaudet University and the National Technical Institute for the Deaf. It was not intended to address the broad range of issues related to the education of individuals who are deaf. We believe the title should be changed to the "Gallaudet University and National Technical Institute for the Deaf Act" to better reflect the primary purpose and scope of the legislation.

In addition to the above recommendations, the Department has a number of technical amendments which we would be happy to provide to the Committee.

Closing Remarks

To ensure that all students have equal educational opportunity, individuals with disabilities must have a full range of educational options available to them. The Rehabilitation Act of 1973 and the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990 have provided students with disabilities a wide and increasing range of postsecondary educational options. However, the education provided by Gallaudet and NTID offers an important option along the continuum of postsecondary options for individuals who are deaf. I believe that by working together, the Administration, Congress, Gallaudet, NTID and individuals who are deaf can ensure that the education these schools provide continues to be a viable and important resource for our Nation's students who are deaf.

Those of us involved in the effort to bring top-quality postsecondary educational opportunities to people with disabilities have a common goal. That goal is to create policies, programs and institutions that facilitate the ability of all Americans to lead independent, productive lives and to contribute to American society. We believe that the Education of the Deaf Act provides an appropriate statutory framework for the activities of these institutions.

Mr. Chairman, on a more personal note, I wish to express my appreciation to Gallaudet University and to the National Technical Institute for the Deaf for their participation and collaboration with the Department not only in this reauthorization process, but in many other areas as well. We have a fine working relationship with both of these Institutions which, of course, makes my job easier. I visited NTID last November and I just want to share with you my very positive impressions of its programs, especially its cutting-edge technology programs. In addition, Secretary Riley has been invited to NTID for a convocation this fall to commemorate 30 years of successful service to persons who are deaf by NTID. Awhile ago the Deputy Secretary and I visited Gallaudet and spent an afternoon visiting classes at the Model Secondary School and the Kendall Demonstration Elementary School. I raise these points as an indication of our close involvement with Gallaudet and NTID.

Mr. Chairman and Members of the Committee, thank you again for allowing me to share some of the Administration's thoughts on the forthcoming reauthorization of the Education of Deaf Act. I will be pleased to answer any questions you or your colleagues may have.

The CHAIRMAN. Our last panel this morning includes Ms. Sarah Snyder, representing the Alexander Graham Bell Association, and Ms. Nancy Bloch, president of the National Association for the Deaf.

It is nice to have both of you with us. Sarah, please proceed.

STATEMENTS OF SARAH E. SNYDER, DEPARTMENT OF PROFESSIONAL PROGRAMS AND SERVICES, ALEXANDER GRAHAM BELL ASSOCIATION FOR THE DEAF; AND NANCY J. BLOCH, PRESIDENT, NATIONAL ASSOCIATION FOR THE DEAF, SILVER SPRING, MD

Ms. SNYDER. Mr. Chairman, Senator Harkin, it is an honor to appear before you today. My name is Sarah Snyder, and I am here on behalf of the Alexander Graham Bell Association for the Deaf.

The Bell Association is a nonprofit international organization that has served consumers who are deaf or hard of hearing, parents and professionals since 1890. We support the reauthorization of the Education of the Deaf Act.

Gallaudet and NTID have served as leaders in research and education of the deaf. Prior to the ADA and Section 504, Gallaudet and NTID were the only institutions where students could be certain they would receive the support services they needed to succeed in higher education. These institutions have had a positive influence on the deaf community. Gallaudet's presence alone has attracted a large number of deaf and hard of hearing professionals to the Washington, DC area.

Since the implementation of the ADA and Section 504, more students today than ever are confident that they will receive the necessary accommodations in mainstream colleges and universities. Fifty-four percent of students between ages 6 and 21 are enrolled in mainstream.

My educational experience as well was in a mainstream setting. I was diagnosed at the age of 20 months with a severe to profound bilateral hearing loss. When I was 5 years old, I attended a deaf kindergarten in the morning and a hearing class in the afternoon.

By the time first grade rolled around, my parents and teachers decided to mainstream me in my home town of Danville, PA.

Twelve years later, I jumped in a U-haul to begin my college career at Princeton University, played a little golf on the golf team while I was there as well, and graduated in 1996. Princeton provided me with the notetaking services that I needed to concentrate on lip reading and participate in my lectures and seminars.

At Princeton, I met eight other students who had hearing losses. We all received support services, ranging from note taking to transcription provided by courtroom stenographers. My friend, Kristin Buehl, who is a junior at Princeton, receives real-time captioning for her lectures, and she credits this technology with her success thus far.

The United States is indeed at the forefront of deaf education. I think we all recognize that. I just came back from a year abroad as a Fulbright graduate student in New Zealand. I researched the experiences of deaf students in postsecondary education who are unable to receive full accommodation due to funding shortages. I myself was completely frustrated when I was denied note taking services while there. The adjustments I made to living and studying in New Zealand helped me to fully appreciate the United States' commitment to serving its citizens who are deaf or hard of hearing.

American passion for improved quality of life is what keeps us at the forefront of deaf education. We must continue to address the inadequacies in education today and try to make a real difference and move forward.

There are four issues I would like to discuss. We urge the adoption of the Council of Organizational Representatives' 1992 Bill of Educational Rights for Children Who are Deaf or Hard of Hearing. The Bell Association recommends that this bill of rights be included in the preamble to the Education of the Deaf Act. Including this bill will set the foundation for true and forthright commitment to ensuring equal educational opportunity for all children who are deaf or hard of hearing.

Second, we recommend universal newborn hearing screening. Representative James Walsh's proposed universal screening bill would give the States support for establishing detection and intervention programs for each and every child at birth. States require newborn screening for so many other health conditions that are not as prevalent as hearing loss. Currently, fewer than 20 percent of newborns are screened for hearing loss. Children diagnosed after 6 months of age experience significant language and social-development delays. To combat these delays, families must receive appropriate information and services as soon as possible after a child is diagnosed with a hearing loss. We ask that universal newborn hearing screening and appropriate follow-up procedures be established.

Third, we recommend promoting full inclusion within educational settings. As the 1988 Commission on Education of the Deaf reported, funds must be targeted toward the following: training and certification of educational interpreters, including oral interpreters; increased support for research and development on technology accommodations. We must train people to provide these new tech-

nologies in educational settings. High priority must be given to improving speech-recognition technology. Voice-to-text transcription would be the ultimate step toward independence for students who are deaf or hard of hearing, decreasing reliance on note takers and interpreters.

Finally, we recommend improving deaf education nationwide. Undeniably, significant improvements have been made in deaf education, yet children continue to fall through the cracks.

For example, two summers ago, I was a counselor at a deaf camp in rural Pennsylvania. Two exuberant and athletic little campers—two of my favorites, Kurt and Kevin—met on the very first day and were inseparable for the rest of the week. They bonded through their love of fishing, swimming, playing pranks like putting frogs in campers' beds, that kind of thing. Sadly, I also believe that they bonded through their mutual lack of language. Both 9 years old, neither Kurt nor Kevin had yet acquired basic speech, lip reading skills or sign language skills. They communicated through gestures and had temper tantrums because they were often unable to understand or make themselves understood. These two kids have fallen through the cracks.

To account for the performance of all students, we recommend that Gallaudet's Center for Assessment and Demographic Studies compile educational scores on those 54 percent of students in mainstream settings, as well as those in special programs. Establishing means of tracking all students with hearing loss will provide more accurate demographic data on educational achievement and real needs for students.

To this end, the Bell Association is working with the office of demographics and encouraging our professional members to participate in Gallaudet's annual survey.

We ask Congress to require Gallaudet and NTID to develop research plans with public input to ensure that research responds to the needs of deaf education across the United States. We also ask Congress to introduce legislation that emphasizes what and how deaf students are taught and that rewards improved achievement scores, graduation rates, and English language proficiency.

In conclusion, we support the reauthorization of the Education of the Deaf Act. We strongly feel that progress stems from the constant drive for improvement. Therefore, we ask that you take the following steps.

First, affirm your support by incorporating the proposed bill of educational rights for children who are deaf or hard of hearing. Promote and vote for the Walsh bill. Support interpreter certification and technology research and development. Build research endeavors that reflect the State of deaf education across the country. Ensure, as best as possible, that there are no more Kurts or Kevins, that each child receives a strong language foundation and a rewarding educational experience.

Thank you.

The CHAIRMAN. Well, thank you for very excellent testimony. It is very helpful to us. You have a long list there, and we will be looking at it closely.

[The prepared statement of Ms. Snyder follows:]

PREPARED STATEMENT OF SARAH E. SNYDER,

Mr. Chairman, members of the committee, it is a honor to appear before you today. My name is Sarah Snyder, and I am a staff member of the Alexander Graham Bell Association for the Deaf.

The Bell Association is an international nonprofit organization that has served consumers who are hard of hearing or deaf, parents, and professionals since 1890. The Association's mission is to empower persons who are hearing impaired to function independently by promoting their rights to learn to use, maintain, and improve all aspects of their verbal communication.

The Bell Association supports the Reauthorization of the Education of the Deaf Act.

Since 1986, Gallaudet and NTID have served as leaders in research and education of the deaf. Prior to the passage of Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act and the American with Disabilities Act, Gallaudet and NTID were the only institutions where students could be certain they would receive the support services necessary to succeed in higher education. The emergence of a deaf community in Washington, DC, attests to the positive influence these two institutions have had. Gallaudet's presence has attracted many young professionals who are deaf or hard of hearing to the DC area.

Since the implementation of federal laws encouraging and directing colleges and universities to provide equal access to all students, more students today have the confidence to seek educations in mainstream colleges and universities.

I was diagnosed at 20 months with a severe-to-profound bilateral hearing loss. I graduated from Danville High School in Pennsylvania in 1992 after twelve years of mainstream education. I received my Bachelor's degree from Princeton University in 1996. Princeton provided me with notetaking services for my courses, which allowed me to concentrate on lip reading and participating in my lectures and seminars.

During college, I met 8 other Princeton students who had hearing losses, all of whom received services that helped them access the educational setting. The accommodations they received varied according to their individual needs and ranged from note taking services to transcriptions provided by courtroom stenographers. My close friend, Kristin Buehl, also a member of the Bell Association, is currently a junior at Princeton Kristin has been profoundly deaf since birth, and she receives real-time captioning for her lectures. She credits this technology with her success thus far.'

The United States is indeed at the forefront of deaf education. I returned last month from a year abroad as a Fulbright Graduate Student to New Zealand. While I was there, I researched the obstacles faced by deaf students in postsecondary education. I experienced these obstacles firsthand when I requested note taking services only to find they were not available. Due to funding crises, New Zealand students who are deaf often are unable to receive full accommodations. The adjustments I made to living and studying in New Zealand, where I had trouble finding close-captioned videotapes and technologies such as real time captioning did not exist, helped me to fully appreciate the United States' commitment to serving its citizens who are deaf or hard of hearing.

It is this passion for improved quality of life that keeps America at the forefront of deaf education. To this end, we must continue to address the inadequacies in our educational system and pursue avenues that will make a real difference in education. There are four issues I would like to discuss today:

(1) Adoption of the Council of Organizational Representatives' (COR) 1992 bill of Educational Rights for Children who are Deaf or Hard of Hearing to ensure that children reap the benefits of these accorded rights.[1] The Bell Association again requests that this bill of rights be included in the Preamble to the Education of the Deaf Act. Including this bill will set the foundation for true and forthright commitment to ensuring equal educational opportunity for all children who are deaf or hard of hearing.

(2) Universal newborn hearing screening. Representative James Walsh's proposed Early Hearing Loss Detection, Diagnosis, and Intervention Act of 1997 provides support to the states for establishing detection and intervention programs for each and every child at birth.[2] Unbelievably, hearing loss occurs in 3 of every 1,000

[1] COR is a coalition of organizations which focus on public policy and other issues related to improving the quality of life for people who are deaf or hard of hearing. Refer to Appendix I for the full text of COR's bill of Educational Rights for Children who are Deaf or Hard of Hearing and for further description of COR's mission and membership.

[2] Refer to Appendix II for text of HR 2923, "Early Hearing Loss Detection, Diagnosis, and Intervention Act of 1997."

births in the United States. Hearing loss is more prevalent than any other health condition for which all states now require newborn screening. Currently, less than 20 percent of all newborns are screened for hearing loss before leaving the hospital. Children with hearing losses who are diagnosed after 6 months of age experience significant language and social-development delays. To combat these delays, families must receive appropriate information and services as soon as possible after a child is diagnosed with a hearing loss. We recommend that universal newborn hearing screening and appropriate follow-up procedures be established.

(3) Promoting FULL inclusion within educational settings. As the 1988 Commission on Education of the Deaf reported, funds must be targeted towards the following:

(a) Training and certification of educational interpreters, including oral interpreters,

(b) Research and development to increase accessibility to currently costly technology accommodations such as real-time captioning and open captioning. High priority also must be given to improving emerging speech-recognition technology. We must train people to provide these new technologies in educational settings. Voice-to-text transcription would be the ultimate step toward independence for students who are deaf or hard of hearing, because it would end their reliance on note takers and interpreters.

(4) Improving deaf education nationwide. Undeniably, while significant improvements have been made in deaf education, children continue to fall through the cracks. For example, two summers ago, I was a counselor at a deaf camp in rural Pennsylvania. Two exuberant and athletic campers, Kurt and Kevin, had never met before, but then were inseparable for the week. These kids bonded through their love of swimming, fishing, and playing pranks. Sadly, I believe they also bonded because of their mutual lack of language. Both 9 years old, Kurt and Kevin had not yet acquired basic speech, lip reading skills, or sign language. They communicated through gestures and exhibited numerous temper tantrums because they were often unable to understand or make themselves understood. These two kids have fallen through the cracks.

Fifty-four percent of students who are deaf or hard of hearing attend mainstream schools.[3] We recommend that Gallaudet's Center for Assessment and Demographic Studies (CADS) compile educational scores on students who are deaf and hard of hearing who are in mainstream as well as special programs. We appreciate that such data is difficult to capture because mainstream students with hearing losses are not systematically accounted for in current statistics. However, establishing means of tracking ALL students with hearing loss will provide more accurate demographic information on educational achievement and real needs for students. To this end, the Bell Association has been, and will continue to work with the office of demographics on collecting this data. Since the survey is voluntary, not all schools participate. We are encouraging all of our members who are public school administrators to participate in the Gallaudet Annual Survey of Deaf and Hard of Hearing Children and Youth.

We ask Congress to require Gallaudet and NTID to develop institutional research plans and seek public input to ensure that research responds to the needs of deaf education across the United States. We also ask Congress to introduce legislation that emphasizes what and how deaf students are taught and that rewards improved standardized test achievement scores, graduation rates, and English-language proficiency.

In conclusion, we support the reauthorization of the Education of the Deaf Act. We strongly feel that, because progress stems from the constant drive for improvement, the Act should be amended to reflect the current needs of students across America. Affirm your support by incorporating the proposed bill of educational rights for children who are deaf or hard of hearing. Promote and vote for the Walsh Bill. Support interpreter certification and technology research and development. Build research endeavors that reflect the state of deaf education across the country. Ensure, as best as possible, that there are no-more Kurts or Kevins, that each child receives a strong language foundation and a rewarding educational experience.

Thank you.

---

[3] *To Assure the Free Appropriate Public Education of All Children with Disabilities (Individuals with Disabilities Education Act, Section 618): Nineteenth Annual Report to Congress on the Implementation of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act.* U.S. Department of Education, 1997, p. A-158. Table AB8, "Number of Children Ages 6-21 Served in Different Educational Environments Under IDEA, Part B by Disability During the 1985-86 Through 1994-95 School Years. This table shows that, in 1994-95, 54 percent of students with hearing impairments attended regular classes or resource rooms.

APPENDIX I

*Council of Organizational Representatives' (COR)**

Educational Rights for Children who are Deaf or Hard of Hearing

1. Children who are deaf or hard of hearing are entitled to appropriate screening and assessment of hearing and vision capabilities and communication and language needs at the earliest possible age, and to the continuation of screening services throughout the educational experience.
2. Children who are deaf or hard of hearing are entitled to early intervention to provide for acquisition of solid language base(s) developed at the earliest possible age.
3. Children who are deaf or hard of hearing are entitled to their parents/guardians full, informed participation in their educational planning.
4. Children who are deaf or hard of hearing are entitled to adult role models who are deaf or hard of hearing.
5. Children who are deaf or hard of hearing are entitled to meet and associate with their peers.
6. Children who are deaf or hard of hearing are entitled to qualified teachers, interpreters, and resource personnel who communicate effectively with the child in the child's mode of communication.
7. Children who are deaf or hard of hearing are entitled to placement best suited to the child's individual needs including, but not limited to social, emotional, and cultural needs; age; hearing loss; academic level; mode(s) of communication; styles of learning; motivational level and family support.
8. Children who are deaf or hard of hearing are entitled to individual considerations for free appropriate education across a full spectrum of education programs.
9. Children who are deaf or hard of hearing are entitled to full support services provided by qualified professionals in their educational settings.
10. Children who are deaf or hard of hearing are entitled to full access to all programs in their educational setting.
11. Children who are deaf or hard of hearing are entitled to have the public fully informed concerning medical, cultural, and linguistic issues of deafness and hearing loss.

Description of the Council of Organizational Representatives (COR)

COR was founded jointly in the early 1980s by the Presidents of the National Association for the Deaf and the Alexander Graham Bell Association for the Deaf. COR member organizations focus on a common mission, working together to improve the quality of life for persons who are deaf or hard of hearing. COR provides a forum for sharing information, coordinating testimony and legislative actions, and sharing knowledge and resources toward target areas that will benefit the broad spectrum of consumers represented or served by its member organizations.

Note: The following organizations were members of COR in 1991/1992 and participated in the creation of the Educational Rights for Children who are Deaf or Hard of Hearing:

- American Academy of Otolaryngology
- American Deafness & Rehabilitation Organization
- Alexander Graham Bell Association for the Deaf
- American Society for Deaf Children
- American Tinnitus Association
- Conference of American Instructors of the Deaf
- Conference of Educational Administrators Serving the Deaf
- The Caption Center
- Corporate Services for the Deaf (corporate, non-voting)
- Deafness Research Foundation
- National Cued Speech Association
- National Association for the Deaf
- New York League for Hard of Hearing People
- Self Help for Hard of Hearing People
- Telecommunications for the Deaf
- Registry of Interpreters for the Deaf

The following organizations are currently members of COR:

- American Academy of Otolaryngology
- American Deafness & Rehabilitation Organization
- Alexander Graham Bell Association for the Deaf
- American Society for Deaf Children
- Conference of American Instructors of the Deaf

- Conference of Educational Administrators Serving the Deaf
- The Caption Center
- National Association for the Deaf
- New York League for Hard of Hearing People
- Self Help for Hard of Hearing People
- Telecommunications for the Deaf
- Registry of Interpreters for the Deaf
- American Academy of Audiology
- American Speech-Language Hearing Association
- National Court Reporters Association

APPENDIX II

HR 29-23

Representative James Walsh's proposed Early Detection and Intervention Act of 1997

HR2923 IH
105th CONGRESS
1st Session
To establish programs regarding early detection, diagnosis, and interventions for newborns and infants with hearing loss.

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

November 7, 1997
Mr. WALSH (for himself, Mr. MCHUGH, Mr. KING of New York, Mrs. MALONEY
of New York, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. FORBES, Mr. BOEHLERT, Mr. LAZIO of New York, and Mr. FOSSELLA) introduced the following bill; which was referred to the Committee on Commerce.

A BILL

To establish programs regarding early detection, diagnosis, and interventions for newborns and infants with hearing loss.

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the 'Early Hearing Loss Detection, Diagnosis, and Intervention Act of 1997.'

SEC. 2. PURPOSES.

The purposes of this Act are to authorize statewide early detection, diagnosis, referral, and intervention networks, technical assistance, a national applied research program, and interagency and private sector collaboration for policy development, in order to assist the States in making progress toward the following goals:

(1) All babies born in hospitals in the United States and its territories should be screened for hearing loss before leaving the hospital (unless the parents of the children object to the screening).

(2) Babies who are not born in hospitals should be screened within the first 3 months of life.

(3) Diagnostic audiologic testing, if indicated, should be performed in a timely manner to allow appropriate referral for treatment/intervention before the age of 6 months.

(4) All universal newborn hearing screening programs should include a component which ensures linkage to diagnosis and the community system of early intervention services.

(5) Public policy in early hearing detection, diagnosis, and intervention should be based on applied research and the recognition that infants, toddlers, and children who are deaf or hard-of-hearing have unique language, learning, and communication needs, and should be the result of consultation with pertinent public and private sectors.

SEC. 3. STATEWIDE EARLY DETECTION, DIAGNOSIS, AND INTERVENTION NETWORKS.

The Secretary of Health and Human Services (in this Act referred to as the 'Secretary'), acting through the Administrator of the Health Resources and Services Administration, shall make awards of grants or cooperative agreements to develop statewide early detection, diagnosis, and intervention networks for the following purposes:

(1) To develop State capacity to support newborn hearing loss detection, diagnosis, and intervention.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

(2) To monitor the extent to which hearing detection is conducted in birthing hospitals throughout the State, and assist in the development of universal newborn hearing detection programs in birthing hospitals and nonhospital birthing sites.

(3) To develop statewide models which ensure effective screening, referral, and linkage with appropriate diagnostic, medical, and qualified early intervention services, providers, and programs within the community.

(4) To collect data on statewide early detection, diagnosis, and intervention that can be used for applied research and policy development.

SEC. 4. TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE, DATA MANAGEMENT, AND APPLIED RESEARCH.

(a) CENTERS FOR DISEASE CONTROL AND PREVENTION—The Secretary, acting through the Director of the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, shall make awards of grants or cooperative agreements to provide technical assistance to State agencies to complement an intramural program and to conduct applied research related to infant hearing detection, diagnosis, and treatment/intervention. The program shall carry out the following:

(1) Provide technical assistance on data collection and management.

(2) Develop standardized procedures for data management to ensure quality monitoring of infant hearing loss detection, diagnosis, and intervention programs.

(3) Study the costs and effectiveness of hearing detection conducted by State-based programs in order to answer issues of importance to national and State policymakers.

(4) Identify the causes and risk factors for congenital hearing loss that might lead to the development of preventive interventions.

(5) Study the effectiveness of early hearing detection, diagnosis, and treatment/intervention programs by assessing the health, developmental, cognitive, and language status of these children at school age.

(6) Promote the sharing of data regarding early hearing loss with State-based birth defects and developmental disabilities monitoring programs for the purpose of identifying previously unknown causes of hearing loss.

(b)NATIONAL INSTITUTES OF HEALTH—The Director of the National Institutes of Health, acting through the Director of the National Institute on Deafness and Other Communication Disorders, shall for purposes of this Act carry out a program of research on the efficacy of new screening techniques and technology, including clinical trials of screening methods, studies on efficacy of intervention, and related basic and applied research.

SEC. 5. COORDINATION AND COLLABORATION.

(a) IN GENERAL—In carrying out programs under this Act, the Administrator of the Health Resources and Services Administration, the Director of the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, and the Director of the National Institutes of Health shall collaborate and consult with other Federal agencies; State and local agencies (including those responsible for early intervention services pursuant to part C of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act); consumer groups serving individuals who are deaf and hard-of-hearing; persons who are deaf and hard-of-hearing and their families; qualified professional personnel who are proficient in deaf or hard-of-hearing children's language and who possess the specialized knowledge, skills, and attributes needed to serve deaf and hard-of-hearing infants, toddlers, children, and their families; other health and education professionals and organizations; third-party payers and managed care organizations; and related commercial industries.

(b) POLICY DEVELOPMENT—The Administrator of the Health Resources and Services Administration, the Director of the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, and the Director of the National Institutes of Health shall coordinate and collaborate on recommendations for policy development at the Federal and State levels and with the private sector, including consumer and professional based organizations, with respect to early hearing detection, diagnosis, and treatment/intervention.

(c) STATE EARLY DETECTION, DIAGNOSIS, AND INTERVENTION NETWORKS; DATA COLLECTION—The Administrator of the Health Resources and Services Administration and the Director of the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention shall coordinate and collaborate in assisting States to establish early detection, diagnosis, and intervention networks under section 3 and to develop a data collection system under section 4.

SEC. 6. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.

(a) STATEWIDE EARLY DETECTION, DIAGNOSIS, AND INTERVENTION NETWORKS—For the purpose of carrying out section 3, there are authorized to be appropriated

$5,000,000 for fiscal year 1999, $8,000,000 for fiscal year 2000, and such sums as may be necessary for each of the fiscal years 2001 through 2003.

(b)TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE, DATA MANAGEMENT, AND APPLIED RESEARCH-

(1) CENTERS FOR DISEASE CONTROL AND PREVENTION—For the purpose of carrying out section 4(a), there are authorized to be appropriated $5,000,000 for fiscal year 1999, $7,000,000 for fiscal year 2000, and such sums as may be necessary for each of the fiscal years 2001 through 2003.

(2) NATIONAL INSTITUTES OF HEALTH—For the purpose of carrying out section 4(b), there are authorized to be appropriated $3,000,000 for fiscal year 1999, $4,000,000 for fiscal year 2000, and such sums as may be necessary for each of the fiscal years 2001 through 2003.

APPENDIX III

SARAH E. SNYDER—Narrative Resume

Sarah Snyder, 23, is currently a staff member of the Department of Professional Programs and Services at the Alexander Graham Bell Association for the Deaf.

Diagnosed with a severe-to-profound bilateral hearing loss at 20 months of age, Snyder was fully mainstreamed through the Danville Pennsylvania school district for grades 1 through 12. Successful academically and involved in extracurricular activities, Snyder was a member of the National Honor Society and was one of the top female golfers in the state, representing Danville at the Pennsylvania State Girls Golf Championship each of her four high school years.

Snyder matriculated at Princeton University in the fall of 1992 to pursue a degree in psychology. Never having received accommodations during her primary and secondary educational careers, she was concerned about how to succeed in large lectures that lasted 50 minutes to 1 and a half hours, not to mention the various 3-hour seminar classes that were offered. Princeton University provided Snyder with full-time notetaking services in her courses so she could concentrate on lip reading and participating in classes. Snyder developed a keen interest in researching issues regarding deafness while at Princeton, completing several independent papers her junior year on counseling issues and deafness and researching her senior thesis on the societal stereotypes regarding deafness. She also continued her extracurricular involvement and graduated in 1996 as a four-year member and three-time captain of the Princeton University Women's Golf team, 1995 and 1996 Academic-All American Women's Golf recipient, photography editor for the Princeton undergraduate and senior yearbooks, and a recipient of the Spirit of Prince ton Award for her "extraordinary contributions to the Princeton campus and community."

Snyder first worked for the Alexander Graham Bell Association for the Deaf as an intern in the fall of 1996 following college graduation. In January 1997, Snyder began her year as a Fulbright Graduate Student to New Zealand. Attending the University of Canterbury in Christchurch, New Zealand, she completed research on the experiences of students who are deaf in postsecondary education as well as research on New Zealand's newly implemented government funding for postsecondary students with disabilities.

Since her return to the United States in late December 1997, Snyder has returned to the Alexander Graham Bell Association, where she is now a staff member. She is pursuing a career path involving disability rights issues in education. Based on her experiences in New Zealand and her research, she believes that such a career "will be full of rewards. Working to improve educational access of students with disabilities is an issue I care about deeply and would very much like to address on a personal level by working with students with disabilities and on a political level by lobbying for the needs of students with disabilities."

The CHAIRMAN. Ms. Bloch.

Ms. BLOCH [Through Sign Interpreter]. Mr. Chairman and members of the committee—or, Senator Harkin—it is a pleasure to have the opportunity to testify as the executive director of the National Association of the Deaf.

We would like to offer our support for the reauthorization. The NAD is the largest organization safeguarding the accessibility and civil rights of 28 million deaf and hard of hearing Americans. Education remains the top priority of deaf and hard of hearing communities, which include parents, educators, service providers, administrators, and various constituency groups.

The EDA was enacted in 1986 "to authorize quality education programs for deaf individuals, to foster improved educational programs for deaf individuals throughout the United States, to reenact and codify certain provisions of the law relating to education of the deaf, and for other purposes."

I will now comment briefly on four points. First, the NAD commends Congress and the administration for carrying out exemplary programs and services at Gallaudet University and the National Technical Institute for the Deaf at RIT, as well as the pre-college programs at Gallaudet.

As an alumna of Gallaudet and former member of the national advisory panels at both institutions, I can attest to the unique programs and services that are unparalleled elsewhere. Pre-college and postsecondary students at Gallaudet and NTID are afforded rich opportunities for direct and unhampered interaction, using American Sign Language and/or spoke English.

This is an especially important consideration since many students now arrive at both institutions from mainstream public education programs where they, in all likelihood, have not enjoyed the same opportunities for direct interaction with their peers and teachers as their hearing counterparts.

Second, Gallaudet and NTID have placed greater emphasis in the past decade on establishing collaborative relationships with pre-college and postsecondary programs across the country. Technological advances, surmounting time, structural and geographical barriers, are fueling opportunities for replication and innovation by students and educators alike. Such networks are continually being developed and refined across the country and reach out as well to global community. International countries continually seek out Gallaudet and NTID for their leadership and expertise.

Third, it is imperative that the EDA retain its current autonomy and that there be no efforts toward legislative consolidation or changes to the title of the Act. To do otherwise would cause irreparable damage to the advances already made in educating deaf and hard of hearing individuals.

Fourth, the original EDA provided for a commissioned study on the status of education of deaf children in the United States. That resulted in presentation of a report containing 52 recommendations to the President and the congress in 1988. It is this report, right here, entitled, "Toward Equality: Education of the Deaf." It concluded, and I quote, that "the present status of education of persons who are deaf in the United States is unsatisfactory. Unacceptably so. This is the primary and inescapable conclusion of the Commission."

While great strides have been made in carrying out many of the Commission's recommendations during the past decade, a good number remain far from fully implemented. We still remain a long way from achieving acceptable educational standards in this country.

The NAD therefore requests that the current EDA reauthorization process include a follow-up study to review and upgrade the original 1988 recommendations.

I would now like to briefly turn to concerns shared by our constituents and their families, and I will provide more for the record.

Opportunities for direct communication in pre- and postsecondary settings, apart from those so abundantly provided at Gallaudet and NTID, remain greatly diminished for deaf and hard of hearing individuals. Communication in mainstream environments often require a third party, whether that be oral, cued speech or sign language interpreters. We do have a great shortage of sign language and other types of interpreters, I might add, across the country. It also includes possibly usable hearing, assistive devices, hearing aides, FM loop systems and the like. These integral supports are not widely available in mainstream educational settings nor provided in a consistent manner.

Emerging technologies are also crucial to leveling the playing field within and outside the educational setting, whether this involves video interaction, courses via the Internet, electronic communications, satellite linkages and so forth. Presentation of audio information in captioned format must become a built-in feature of such technologies.

Both Gallaudet and NTID are forging ahead. They are establishing new inroads along these lines. Our great Nation has begun to work toward achieving such a level playing field.

Recently issued FCC rules will require captioning on nearly all television programming over the next 8 to 10 years, and we applaud Congress for mandating this FCC action. But much more still needs to be done.

For instance, deaf and hard of hearing children still cannot go to first-run movies, for example, "The Titanic," or "Amistad." They cannot go with their parents and their family members and their friends—something that most of us take for granted.

First-run movies not only provide cultural enrichment, but they also are educational in nature. Simply put, inclusion will work only where there is no exclusion.

These concerns may seem trivial, but they are most certainly not trivial to us. Until we reach an equal par with our hearing counterparts, until our communication needs are no longer an afterthought, and until we enjoy the same range of choices and options as any other American, our work remains cut out for us.

The NAD therefore urges the committee to retain funding authority for Gallaudet and NTID, with no change to its present title or autonomy.

The NAD further urges the committee to institute a follow-up study to review the current status of educating persons who are deaf and hard of hearing in the United States and to issue new recommendations for the 21st century.

Mr. Chairman and Senator Harkin, thank you again for the opportunity to speak on behalf of the National Association of the Deaf. I welcome any questions that you may have.

[The prepared statement of Ms. Bloch follows:]

PREPARED STATEMENT OF NANCY J. BLOCH

Mr. Chairman and members of the committee: I am pleased to have the opportunity to appear before the Committee on behalf of the National Association of the Deaf (NAD) to provide support for the reauthorization of the Education of the Deaf Act of 1986, as amended in 1992.

The HAD is the oldest and largest consumer-based organization that safeguards the accessibility and civil rights of 28 million deaf and hard of hearing Americans.

Since the founding of the NAD in 1880, education has remained among the top priorities of the deaf and hard of hearing community, which includes parents, educators, administrators, service providers, interpreters, and numerous other constituency groups having a vested interest in educational matters.

Current activities of the NAD include advancing policies to implement the highest standards of quality education for deaf and hard of hearing individuals in pre-college as well as post-secondary settings.

Education remains a critical, if not paramount, building block for every individual, and unquestionably more so for deaf and hard of hearing children ad adults for whom communication and language needs pose a unique challenge to the process of lifelong learning.

The Education of the Deaf Act (EDT) was enacted in 1986 "to authorize quality educational programs for deaf individuals, to foster improved educational programs for deaf individuals throughout the United States, to reenact and codify certain provisions of the law relating to education of the deaf, and for other poses." I will now elaborate further on these four points.

First, the HAD commends Congress and the Administration for efforts to carry out exemplary programs ad services for deaf and hard of hearing individuals at Gallaudet University and the National Technical Institute for the Deaf at Rochester Institute of Technology (NTID). This also includes Pre-College Programs ad Pre-College National Mission Programs at Gallaudet.

As an alumna of Gallaudet and former member of national advisory panels at both institutions, I can attest to the unique programs and services that are unparalleled elsewhere.

At Gallaudet and NTID, pre-college and post-secondary students have rich opportunities for direct communication access to quality education and lifelong learning programs and services, using American Sign Language and/or spoken English as their language of preference.

Students are able to enjoy unhampered interaction with peers and colleagues as well as enhanced opportunities for participation in academic and extracurricular activities.

This is an especially important consideration since many students now eve at both institutions from mainstream public education programs, where they in all likelihood have not enjoyed the same opportunities for direct interaction with their peers and teachers as their hearing peers.

The NAD believes that direct and uninhibited communication access to all facets of educational programming is essential if the deaf or hard of hearing child or adult is to realize his or her full potential.

Maintenance of appropriate funding for Gallaudet and NTID pursuant to the EDA as it stands should remain a high priority.

Second, Gallaudet and NTID, as model institutions of higher education, are the recognized leaders for optimal accessibility ad provision of quality programs and services. Both institutions have placed greater emphasis in the past decade on establishing collaborative relationships with pre-college and post-secondary programs across the country.

This is being accomplished more and more through technological advances—surmounting time, structural, ad geographic barriers—thus fostering greater opportunities for replication and innovation by students and educators alike.

Such networks are continually being developed and refined across the country, and reach out as well to global communities.

The leadership ad expertise of Gallaudet and NTID is continually sought out by international countries seeking to improve educational and employment opportunities for deaf and hard of hearing children and adults. We cannot ignore the important role that both institutions play in this country as well as in the international community.

Third, consolidating the separate authorities for Gallaudet and NTID in the original EDA of 1986 was certainly an appropriate move, given the parallel missions of both institutions. The 1992 reauthorization process provided ether refinements.

It is imperative that the EDA retain its current autonomy, and that there be no efforts towards legislative consolidation or changing the title of the act.

Doing otherwise would cause irreparable damage to the advances already made in educating deaf and hard of hearing children, and set back for decades specific areas that require strengthening.

The NAD urges the Committee to renew its commitment to furthering the leadership efforts of Gallaudet and NTID by retaining EDA in its present form, including retention of the current title of the act.

Fourth, the recommendation I just outlined is further underlined by the fact that the original act provided for a commissioned study on the status of education of deaf

children in the United States, which resulted in presentation of a report containing 52 recommendations to the President and the Congress in 1988.

The report, "Toward Equality: Education of the Deaf" concluded "the present status of education for persons who are deaf in the United States is unsatisfactory. Unacceptably so. This is the primary and inescapable conclusion of the Commission."

While great strides have been made in carrying out many of the Commission's recommendations during the past decade, a good number of these remain far from fully implemented-we still remain a long way from achieving acceptable educational standards in this country. This also attests to the importance of recognizing that EDA goes beyond finding authority for Gallaudet and NTID.

I might also add that the 1988 Report has indeed become a guiding source for the establishment of fundamental principles underlying education programs and services for deaf and hard of hearing individuals in this country. Educators and administrators of educational programs alike continue to look at these recommendations, despite the fact that these badly need updating, as they set and implement policy.

The NAD therefore respectfully requests, also on behalf of numerous constituency groups, that the current EDA reauthorization process authorize a new study to review and upgrade the original 1988 Commission on Education of the Deaf (COED) recommendations.

Having covered the above, I will now turn to key concerns shared by deaf and hard of hearing individuals and their families—our constituents—on educational issues.

Opportunities for direct communication in the pre-college as well as postsecondary educational setting, other than those abundantly provided at Gallaudet and NTID, remain greatly diminished for deaf and hard of hearing students. Many students must increasingly rely on third parties, i.e., oral, cued speech, or sign language interpreters, or if they have usable hearing, assistive listening devices, to achieve minimal levels of communication access within the classroom setting—if at all.

Another reality is that access to opportunities for peer group interaction are all too often diminished further—thus creating greater isolation for deaf and hard of hearing students in pre-college and post-secondary environments where they are the minority. All too often the missing formula in the equation involves direct communication. Without question, Gallaudet and NTID provide this missing formula.

Essentially, the NAD believes that all deaf and hard of hearing children are entitled to a free and appropriate public education in an environment that promotes development of their intellectual, social, and emotional capabilities.

Further, the NAD believes that direct and uninhibited communication access to all facets of educational programming—curricular and extracurricular—is essential for deaf and hard of hearing children to realize their full human potential.

Emerging technologies, including the use of assistive devices and/or services, are needed to achieve accessibility, ad to level the playing field for deaf and hard of hearing children and adults—both within and outside of the educational setting.

This includes video- and text-based systems for interactive communication, whether this involves two-way teleconferencing, courses delivered via the Internet, satellite video-conferences, usage of electronic messaging and chat opportunities, and so forth.

We often take for grated information that is provided through auditory channels, not realizing the potential for provision of such information in captioned format, whether through computers, televisions, telecommunications equipment, and so forth. Remote sign language interpreting services are also now becoming available. Assistive technologies are also integral to accessibility, and these include as hearing aids, FM audio loop and related types of listening systems, stenographic services, and so forth.

Networking in this manner permits deaf and hard of hearing students and their peers, educators, parents, service providers, and administrators to interact in ways never before.

Both Gallaudet and NTID are forging ahead, establishing new inroads along these lines, creating new and heretofore unprecedented opportunities for sharing of critical resources for replication as well as innovation.

Ensuring full access to and usage of the above-mentioned technologies—whether emerging, assistive, or in current usage—are among the topmost priorities of the NAD.

Without an equal playing field, deaf and hard of hearing individuals cannot yet enjoy the same rights and privileges as their hearing peers in this country.

Our great nation is on the road to achieving such a level playing field. Recent rules promulgated by the Federal Communications Commission (FCC) will require captioning on nearly all television programming over the next eight to ten years.

We applaud Congress for mandating this FCC action and enabling the United States to become a world leader in the provision of television access. But much still needs to be done.

A classic example is the ability of children to go to first-run movies with their parents, family members, and friends—something that most of us readily take for granted. Deaf and hard of hearing children and adults still cannot go to first-run movies, and are all too often deprived of equitable exposure to the arts, culture, and heritage, as well as opportunities for literacy development.

The application of captioning and related video technologies across the board would, without question, instantly level the playing field.

These concerns may seem trivial. They are most certainly not trivial to us. We live with such inequities daily, along with our hearing family members, friends, and colleagues.

Until we reach an equal par with our hearing peers, until our communication needs are no longer an afterthought, and until we enjoy the same range of choices and options as any other American—our work remains cut out for us.

The NAD therefore urges you to retain funding authority for Gallaudet and NTID under the Education of the Deaf Act, with no change to its present title or autonomy.

The NAD further urges you to institute review of the present status of education of deaf and hard of hearing children in the United States.

Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, thank you again for the opportunity to share the thoughts of the National Association of the Deaf, and I welcome any questions that you may have.

The CHAIRMAN. Thank you for excellent and very helpful testimony.

Ms. Snyder, you spoke about the barriers that you encountered as a graduate student in New Zealand. In your experience have you noted similar problems in the United States, and if so, how were those difficulties overcome?

Ms. SNYDER. In the United States?

The CHAIRMAN. Yes, that were similar to those in New Zealand.

Ms. SNYDER. I am far more appreciative of what the United States has to offer now, yet we do have a long way to go, and I really agree with what Ms. Bloch just said about inclusion meaning no inclusion—providing technology in all settings.

I agree that children are still not able to access most of the programs they need to establish a strong language foundation at an early age. The FCC has passed wonderful legislation, and I believe 95 percent of all programs within the home are to be close-captioned by 2006. That is a wonderful step. Next, we need open captioning in all settings, and as soon as possible.

I am thrilled that we have the Motion Picture Access Committee working toward the goal of open-captioned movies, for example. But for example, I am going to a 10 o'clock showing of the James Bond movie this Saturday at the Mazza Gallerie here in Chevy Chase. It is a great movie. I am not sure I want to get up at 10 o'clock in the morning to see it, but that is the only time I can see an open-captioned version. But it is progress, and we recognize that, and that is what has gotten us as far as we are now.

Obviously, that is one of the obstacles, the technology in all settings; real-time captioning in lectures so that we are not relying upon human resources. People have needs and children and jobs to look after, and we have to combine their scheduling needs with ours. Moving toward voice-to-text transcription would be the best thing I can foresee for removing any current obstacles that I have within an educational/professional setting.

The CHAIRMAN. Thank you.

Ms. Bloch, I was especially interested in your testimony about the ability to have access to distance learning and all of those things. What is going on to try to assist those who are involved in that technology to develop processes which would help those who are hard of hearing?

Ms. BLOCH. I think this applies both to deaf and hard of hearing people regarding long-distance learning. The playing field is level between the two groups, but distance learning does not only mean satellite hookups or two-way telephone conference calls or videoconferencing and that sort of thing. It also means preparing people for what happens when they are watching and want to get involved in that type of technology. We have to make sure there is access for that, too, prior to and during and after such distance education opportunities.

There are considerations for modifying when you—well, considerations for the needs for interpreters, for example, and other types of assistive devices. It is not cut-and-dried. It is not black and white. Gallaudet and NTID are making wonderful strides forward in distance learning, but I think the rest of the country might learn from those institutions how best to be more accommodating to the variety of people who are going to use them, not just deaf and hard of hearing people.

The CHAIRMAN. This is perhaps a question I should know the answer to, but is there an effort for an international signing for all countries—China and wherever—to develop a signing which can be mutually understood?

Ms. BLOCH. This is a question that was asked the last time I was here and testified. Each country has its own sign language which is distinct in its own language, and it fits the culture of that country. There is no universal sign language, no. But I can tell you that when I travel to another country and meet other deaf people who have a different language, it is easier for me to communicate with them than it would be for you to communicate with someone who has a spoken language that is different than yours. We are much better at gestural communication than hearing people.

The CHAIRMAN. Well, is there any desire or effort to find a common language?

Ms. BLOCH. You might ask the same question in regard to spoken languages. I think that you will find that the answer would be the same. The NAD is the U.S. representative for the World Federation of the Deaf, and when the Federation comes together—they come together every 4 years—and the method—now, understand this is not a language—but the method of communication that some use recognizes the international sign that people from different countries can use to perhaps communicate, but in no way is this a language.

I hope that answers your question.

The CHAIRMAN. Fine. Thank you.

Senator Harkin, I will have to leave.

Senator HARKIN. Just for your information, I might add that the anthropologist, Margaret Mead, once suggested in a written treatise that sign language ought to be the universal language, so that you would have the same sign in Italian, French, English and Russian, say, for a cat. You would not have to know anything more

than that; you would know one sign, and that could become the universal language for all people. I thought it was a great paper that she submitted and a great suggestion, but it was 25, 30 years ago when she wrote that, I suppose, and she has since died.

The CHAIRMAN. Well, thank you all.

Senator HARKIN. I do not have any other questions, except, Ms. Snyder, I just wanted to ask about the support that you received at Princeton. Is that kind of support that you received at Princeton when you went there generally available at other schools?

Ms. SNYDER. I think it depends on the institution and their commitment and their reputation.

Senator HARKIN. Did you know that they had that support system before you went to Princeton?

Ms. SNYDER. Yes, I did. I was well aware of that.

Senator HARKIN. Did you request——

Ms. SNYDER. Well, I applied for admission not certain what I would receive. Upon receiving the acceptance letter, I also received a letter stating—it was a general letter to all students, obviously—that if you require any special services, please contact so-and-so, and I did that and was made aware of the services.

Senator HARKIN. As you went through Princeton, did you require other types of services, and were they forthcoming? I mean, did they give you those other services that you might have requested?

Ms. SNYDER. Would they have? Yes.

Senator HARKIN. Did you—did you require or request other services?

Ms. SNYDER. No, I did not. I was able to do well enough with note taking services.

Senator HARKIN. With what they had, you were able to do well enough.

Ms. SNYDER. However, I will admit that I was not as strong a self-advocate then as I am now; and looking back on it, had I known about real-time captioning and its emerging use, I would have asked for it. I relied a lot more on written material and extra reading to get by in my classes, on top of note taking services, and I generally enjoyed my seminars far more than I did my large lectures.

Senator HARKIN. Thank you very much.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. Thank you, Senator Harkin, also, for all you have done in this field.

I thank all the witnesses, and I assure you that your testimony has been listened to and that we will work on those problems which have been elaborated, and hopefully, we can move this legislation fairly rapidly.

Thank you all, and good luck.

[Whereupon, at 12:06 p.m., the committee was adjourned.]

○

CO

46-678 (64)

ISBN 0-16-056365-8

£1